

Bassetlaw District Local Development Framework

2012

Site Allocations Issues & Options Individual Response Record



BASSETLAW
DISTRICT COUNCIL
NORTH NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1	1	Option A.
1	2	I cannot agree or disagree until the location is disclosed. The Junction of Station road, Mattersey road, Great North road and Blythe road is already dangerous due to the location of the Blue Bell, Top Shop (POst Office) and Fish and Chip Shop and total lack of public or private parking areas, except the pub. This junction already has traffic lights and pedestrian crossings which obscure vision. Any increase in housing should not cause additional hazard at this junction.
1	3	Yes
1	4	REMOVED
1	5	REMOVED
1	6	REMOVED
2	1	Yes
2	2	No additional growth without major updating of facilities.
2	3	None
2	4	Not supported
2	5	Option A
2	6	Stay around existing sites
2	7	Together at existing sites
3	1	Option A
3	2	Yes, though I'm worried by the "at least" statement. I'd be a lot happier if a firm number was committed to that had some enforcement behind it. Also, I think that any new houses should be built in keeping with the existing buildings in the village. There are already too many new houses that are totally out of keeping with the village character.
3	3	Yes, as this would give about the right number of new houses. However, I would like to see the mix of house sizes and types in these developments to make a final call. Also, when you "say 9 dwellings that have recently been started", the evidence is that there is only one being build and it's been going on a long time.
3	4	In line with existing infill, 408 and 409
3	5	I think that the map should indicate the village envelope for building as there are potential sites outside this that should be identified as so.
3	6	Yes.
4	1	Yes Worksop should be allowed to grow both in housing and employment growth.
4	2	Site 4 & W9- ideal as its size is ideal for a housing scheme and contained industrial/employment opportunities.
4	3	Site 4 & W9- ideal as its size is ideal for a housing scheme and contained industrial/employment opportunities.
4	4	Site 4 & W9- ideal as its size is ideal for a housing scheme and contained industrial/employment opportunities. The size of the site is big enough to show a serious commitment to improving the town.
5	1	Yes, I deem the changes to be positive and good for the town.
5	2	Yes, I think the estates which have been built (Bracken Way) are neighbourly pleasing to the eye and bring in promising working families to the village I'd like to see all area allocated for new homes to be developed to go ahead.
5	3	All
5	4	All, we need as much opportunity for employment as possible.
5	5	A mix would be good maybe a shopping complex restaurants something to bring people into the village.
5	6	None at this point.
5	7	Sites 23 and 61 is valued and used by many residents and we would like to keep this land as it is.
5	8	Option A.
5	9	Around existing sites, concerns of bringing down house prices. I would not want to pay the high rent and council tax in my area if a caravan would be allocated near us.
5	10	I think it should be up to the travellers who wish to live in that area.
6	1	Yes employment and housing
6	2	Sites 187 and 197. Plumtree area
6	3	Good idea for employment. Could you try for leisure complex including outdoor crown green bowls, bigger swimming pool?
6	4	Yes, Tickhill Road near sewerage with houses on Baulk Lane- health hazard (Site 182).
7	1	Yes

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
7	2	HOUSING. If there are homeless people then they need housing, if people are overcrowded in their current accommodation because of relatives sharing then they need housing! QED! It is up to the Government, Local Authority and Building Industry to work together morally ensure this happens. All people seem to want is for the so called 'value' of their property to increase (if you realize it's 'value' you still have to pay for another!!) However if additional private housing is built in Bassetlaw a percentage will be bought for investment and rented out, a further small percentage will be purchased by local people upgrading, the majority will be bought by people from outside Bassetlaw. Many of the latter group will continue to work outside Bassetlaw and hence be commuters incurring more use of imported oils and vehicles to do so, the majority of the money they will spend locally will go to the now 'proposed with big fanfares' 4 large supermarkets, 2 medium Asda's 4 small Tesco's and 3 small Sainsbury's employing local people at near minimum wages. Maybe we house just house those without! Bassetlaw DC have those figures.
7	3	EMPLOYMENT. Again if we have unemployment we need to eliminate it. If we are not proactive we will continue the trend of becoming a dormitory town for Nottingham, Doncaster and Sheffield leaving only the scraps provided by distribution and service sector employment. We need more employment in the community for residents to eliminate commuting. Those employed by the Local Authority to carry out what is possibly it's most important task, employment generation, should be reporting to the public on a regular basis, whatever the economic climate successful outcomes are the only ones acceptable!!
7	4	Living on the Ashes Park Avenue Estate is in general a pleasant and comfortable experience which I would be happy for others to share on Site 35 if it were developed in a similar manner
7	5	However obvious access is currently only via the roundabout (which would require part-time traffic lights, and a pedestrian crossing in line with the bridle way)) entering Churchill Way and would still be insufficient to cope with up to 700 new dwellings
7	6	Access via Montford Road is not feasible as it is not wide enough to carry more than traffic to Gateford Nursing Home and would require the removal of mature trees (which need to be the subject of TPO's prior to any development) along the bridle path to Owday Wood and Owday Lane
7	7	Access via the roundabout at the junction of Ashes Park and Edison Park Avenues is possible if a road is built through to the development site but it again would need to respect the stream and wildlife corridor and incorporate part time traffic lights and a pedestrian crossing. It would prove to be more acceptable to the community if these measures were carried out prior to the commencement of development
7	8	Additionally there is a requirement for at least 15% affordable housing. This is absolutely fine, however why are these always hidden away in one place in the corner of a development? What is wrong with making every sixth property built by each developer a Registered Provider property spread out over the site?
7	9	On the current development of Ashes Park Avenue there are 39 Registered Provider Properties parked in a corner, but amongst the remaining properties there are at least 100 further rented, and the owner occupier population has had at least a 35% change over the last 10 years.
7	10	W1, W12, W13, W8, W6, 26, 45, 371 These areas have almost instant access to main roads and would have minimal effect on current housing
7	11	However should a major possibility come on the horizon W9 could be ideal but I am against mixed use as mainly disadvantaged residents are placed in these positions.
7	12	I do not support mixed sites, because they reduce the environmental quality of residents
7	13	The area indicated as Potential Protected Open Space along the length of Ashes Park and Edison Park Avenues between the existing developments is currently protected and should remain so. It as been developed with empathy to the Old Gateford Conservation Area designated in 2009. It is a clean, fresh, green landscaped area occupied by a variety of shrubs and trees shielding from continuous visibility around 800 homes and a Junior School built within the last 20 years. Hidden between the trees is a stream with 2 small ponds frequented by mallards, herons and moorhens. Young children fish in the stream for sticklebacks and frogspawn, older children on bikes use an area they call the ramps to hone their skills for BMX tracks. A football team trains at the goal posts area, Worksop Junior Harriers do extra endurance training there. Hundreds of dog walkers, hikers and joggers from within and outside the immediate estate enjoy it's amenity on a daily basis. It is a wildlife corridor. It is a pleasant place to live in, any development of this existing green corridor would be a disaster.
7	14	The young people of the new estates in Gateford continually bemoan the lack of facilities for them in the local area. During and since the Gateford builds no Section 106 monies appears to have reached that part of Worksop. We trust that the same mistake will not be made in the future. Therefore I suggest when the DPD is Published in late 2012 it should include provision of monies for a Youth Centre for the Gateford Area. My suggested location is behind the tree line at mid point between the start and finish of site reference 28 & W6 on Gateford Road. I suggest this location because it is currently surrounded by non developed land and 200yards from any current housing. This being the case potential occupants of the surrounding land would be well aware of pre determined issues! I do not support mixed purpose (employment & housing)
7	15	Street Furniture is excessive and ugly, takes space, require holes in the ground and concrete to support it, attracts graffiti, gets in the way of mowing/requires strimming, reduces pavement widths, gets damaged and required expensive replacement/repair. I understand and agree with the need for traffic signing, site/road location signage etc. etc. However with some thought and planning, i.e. Lampposts placed at road junctions so that road name signs can be attached to at about 4m above ground level could take up to 8 signs of the ground at one road junction. Utilisation of lampposts in other locations could save councils millions. Get the guide book changed before more development takes place!
7	16	I believe my opinion has been given within the above questions comments. However as a general rule I subscribe to housing being built in a pleasant environment away from road and industrial noises. Employment should be located near to main roads and hidden by landscaping

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
7	17	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
7	18	Only sufficient sites should only be created to meet the requirements of law. They should not be in any position that would interfere with what could be considered as 'normal residents' and should only be allowed to occupy the site as long as strict criteria on the general maintenance of the sites is maintained. The sites should be distributed equally throughout Bassetlaw and strict provision put in place to ensure the children's education.
7	19	Separate but adjacent sites
7	20	None identified.
8	1	Yes
8	2	Also why on earth are we looking to build on yet more greenfield sites - cant we be a bit more creative than just mindlessly filling fields and ruining the local environment and countryside
8	3	REMOVED
8	4	I would like to see area 30 developed as its currently derelict and dingy land.
8	5	Also areas 90,38,11,26,45,218,151.
8	6	Areas i would NOT LIKE to see developed are 9 and 35 - i am 110% against any housing development on these two sites!!
8	7	All employment sites i would prefer to see developed - create some jobs and the rest will follow!!!!
8	8	All mixed use sites except the plan that would replace Kilton Golf Course - Good location but not at the expense of the municipal golf course facility I'm afraid
8	9	All open spaces should be protected in my opinion
8	10	REMOVED
8	11	Yes it would be great to see some kind of pub/restaurant go on this site - give us some restaurants to stop us getting in our cars and spending our money elsewhere!!
8	12	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
8	13	REMOVED
8	14	REMOVED
8	15	Site 9- Having seen the "Site allocations - issues and options consultation" document on your website i wish to write to give my thoughts against the proposed housing site area 9 from the Worksop plan map. My issues to be considered: 1. I think building houses here would conflict with national and local Planning Policy by building on a greenfield site.
8	16	2. Any new houses would overshadow, overlook and cause loss of privacy to my property.
8	17	3. Increased traffic will be generated, access, road safety and parking problems would be caused to an already over busy area.
8	18	4. Loss of trees and hedgerows would be caused.
8	19	5. Loss of ecological habitats and landscapes - there are masses of wildlife living and thriving off the land in these areas.
8	20	6. It doesn't matter what design, appearance, layout, density and mass of buildings they come up with - they cannot substitute precious open space.
8	21	7. It will have a detrimental effect on the listed building "Manor Lodge" next to Lodge Farm with yet more cheap nasty houses blotting the landscape and ruining the buildings historic grounds and setting.
8	22	8. the area is already overdeveloped and like a "rabbit warren".
8	23	9. Inadequate infrastructure to support the development - where are the extra schools and places of work/jobs for all these extra people?
8	24	10. This area (9) is a haven for walkers, both local and from further afield and yet more unsightly, cheap houses (which is what they will be) will be a blight on the landscape and of detriment to the public already living in the neighbouring properties and area.
8	25	11. I would welcome any opportunity to discuss this further. I am in favour of development for Worksop - By god do we need it! But it needs to be the right development and lazily chucking houses up on fields is not the way forward... create jobs and stop people driving out of the area to spend their money and the rest will look after itself!!
9	1	Option A.
9	2	Access in and out of the village by road should be by A57 road only. Crockett's hill is not an option!!!! Any access onto the A57 in or near the village, eg near the junction to cocketts hill road where there is a sharp bend is not an option. Generally the A57 traffic situation in the village now and in the next 25 years is bad and will get worse. School traffic/congestion is already bad. There are very (if any) employment opportunities in the village. The Toll bridge does not need any more traffic throughput at rush hours. The above plus flood risk i.e. cost to rate payers for emergency services as and when, is not acceptable. The above plus flood risk i.e. cost to rate payers for emergency services as and when, is not acceptable. Conclusion - Dunham is not an appropriate place for property development.
9	3	I do not recollect seeing the 'residents questionnaire' maybe I missed it.
9	4	Any family facilities, eg. shops are non existent in Dunham
9	5	Together - will reduce traffic and pedestrian traffic between the two if separate.
10	1	Yes
10	2	Option A

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
10	3	Yes, provided that present infrastructure is checked for purpose. I feel that the sewage treatment is not good enough even now and that a new unit should be built or the present one at Nornay upgraded to accommodate any extra housing.
10	4	Sites 178 and 590
10	5	Site 482 can be prone to flooding, Site 266 has narrow access to a busy road and also spans a public right of way.
10	6	Yes
10	7	Existing locations
10	8	Together
11	1	Site 4- Whilst I agree that you have to build houses and businesses around the areas, I would urge you to have a very detailed look at what is available around Worksop before you and your colleagues destroy much of what is left of our greenbelt and especially the Kilton Golf course and the Amenities there which are great, adjoining this is the large recreation ground of course ? used by football teams across the area and is also used by lots of the residents for many things -not forgetting the Worksop Festival, this is the only area at this end of town available for local residents to access on to the footpaths there. I think you should look at the brown field site option with more urgency e.g. THE VESUVIUS SITE WHICH NEEDS URGENT MOVEMENT, WHICH IS IDEAL FOR DEVELOPMENT OF COURSE AS YOU KNOW. Not only would development of the Golf course area be a bad decision it would also be a fantastic BLOT on the scenery for anyone driving into the town from the A1 from Blyth and it would certainly make them wonder why the local council in their wisdom created entry into Worksop on the main road from Blyth??? it would certainly fill them with enthusiasm. Another suggestion is that you use what will be the OLD TESCO SITE for housing as they are not going to need it are they? They will be too busy trying to sort out the coming traffic problems on their new roundabout on Carlton Road!! Especially when the crossing gates are down, watch this space.
11	2	1. From the A 1 at Five lane ends we have the Beautiful Clumber woodlands which is still reasonably nice coming into Worksop. 2. From Nottingham coming into Worksop past the Lion Gates and the woodlands around Hannah park area still very nice. 3. From Sheffield we still have open space on entry again quite nice. Areas for consideration within Worksop for these project should firstly include: a) The Old Tesco site that will become available soon b) Vesuvius site c) The old textile site at the end of High Hoe Road. 4. The proposal on Blyth road would make the biggest Blot on the Worksop landscape imaginable with an Industrial estate on both sides of the road ?? and the total destruction of the ONLY open space on this side of town a fantastic amenity for this area of town - let alone the Golf course - which in turn would provide anyone driving into Worksop from Blyth to certainly question the sign ? Gateway the Dukeries -it would look more like a Gateway to the industrial estates. I would suggest that more serious consultation takes place on how many actual brown field sites we have available for industry first, before any green belt land is even considered. 5. Bassetlaw County Council has adopted a very focused strategic approach to play /sport facilities since 2007 re improved recreational areas, what you are proposing of Blyth Road would be going against this policy and destroying one of the best recreational areas in Worksop. 6. All the ex mining land should be utilised to its maximum potential re- industrialisation first.
11	3	I find it very worrying that the council do not have the knowledge or the will to control their own destiny Re-Worksop !! new housing development. Many houses are unoccupied in the Manton area mainly because it wants bringing up to date, The old textile factory site could be used to build on there which could improve the quality of the Manton area, you have allowed Tesco to build on a site again that could have been used for housing ? instead you will have a very interesting traffic problem ? Tesco didn't need a bigger site anyway ? the site they are on currently is bigger !! why could they not enlarge that one ?. The Vesuvius Site could be dual purpose housing and retail like in many other towns. Lets not forget that it is about the quality of life for people and not just willy- Nilly building projects that will also detract from the look of a town when you enter it from many different routes, On the hill near the Colsterdale area is a sign that says welcome to the Dukeries - an area of outstanding beautiful countryside - not-- welcome to the building site. the available green sites for kids and other activities is important, we have quite a nice area off Blyth road near the golf course !! a nice recreation ground which is very well used and leads to countryside walks which go for miles which is needed for football clubs and many more activities and The Worksop Show each year and of course is adjoining the lovely Kilton Golf Course another facility which was mentioned in despatches at one point. Whilst i appreciate that we have to have houses I think you need a re-think and a very good look around the area (Yourselves) before anything is set down in stone and certainly not a decision that developers should have any say in. It was yourselves who were voted in not developers.
12	1	Site 35- Anyone on the Ashes Park side of Worksop will tell you what a task(chose that word carefully) it is to exit either end of either Ashes Park Ave or Eddison Ave at peak traffic times with the queue right back to the second roundabout at times with A60 traffic using the estate road as a rat run from the S60 to the A57 and vice versa. Any addition to that traffic would be a disaster. The information states that this has been taken into account but does not explain HOW ? The ideal solution for me would be to put in 2 link roads, one to the A57 at the Woodsetts junction/ A57 bypass/ Sheffield A57/ roundabout and the other to the A60/ Doncaster road at its junction with Owday Lane end as this would also give you the opportunity to work on the bad bend at that point on Doncaster Road so kill 2 birds with one stone. This give NO connection to ANY part of Ashes Park Ave or Eddison Ave from the new proposed estate (area 35). What are your thoughts on this?
12	2	My other concern is that like our part of Gateford with its designated open spaces the 800 developments proposed by the developer as to the 700 proposed by the council's team is just greed. Groundwater has to have somewhere to go and overdeveloping the area will just add to the complications, remember one average tree consumes 400 litres a day so plant some trees i place of the houses and some open green belt, this is why we came here in the first place, we suffer the £1700 pounds a year council tax gladly so I can wake up in the morning to look out over ever changing fields and trees a never ending supply of wildlife also to keep my grandchildren entertained. We can never stop development but at least we can try our best to get it right.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
13	1	Agree- We need some development in Wheatley. At least 60% of the population is in the OAP category. In order to make our village, a viable and sustainable community with a school, a shop, a post office with a public house, it needs to grow.
13	2	We need semi-detached, smaller dwellings for starter/retirement homes.
13	3	Feel Top Pasture Lane is best for development.
14	1	Option A
14	2	I think 12 is a maximum. Preferably 10 or less to keep the rural aspect. We have already had a lot of building in the village.
14	3	Site 239 would be preferably with it being accessed by 2 roads and having space around to keep within the rural aspect (bearing in mind the bottom end of this land may flood).
14	4	REMOVED
15	1	We need some semi-detached smaller houses for young families to keep the village alive and stop it just becoming a place for OAPs.
16	1	Option A
16	2	Crookford Kennels, Jockey Lane, Elkesley. DN22 8BN. This 1.5 acre brownfield site, between a scrapyard & the A1, considered outside the local plan area for residential housing would provide (due to the direct A1 access) for both transit & residential pitches without lorries & units going through any villages.
17	1	It seems well thought out and sound.
17	2	Option A
17	3	Yes, but no building until the A1 bridge has been built as congestion is a real issue. There is an accident waiting to happen as people lose patience and take risks crossing the A1 traffic.
17	4	No - I do not wish to see the development along Yew Tree Road for 33 dwellings granted. It should be an area of amenities for the residents
17	5	248 or 246 both brownfield sites which 247 isn't.
17	6	The need for more facilities e.g. lack of bus service after 6pm and none on Sunday could be a problem, especially for young people. Also already have 10% housing association - need to keep the mix. Do need affordable housing for young people to buy
17	7	The village has nearly 400 dwellings so extra building should be in-line with the present housing to maintain the good mix of age ranges. There would need to be better facilities if more housing was added.
17	8	I do not understand why the site by Twyford Bridge was dismantled. It was clean, neat and never had problems, in fact the opposite as they kept the verges litter free. I would probably say concentrate around existing sites
17	9	I don't know
17	10	Common blue butterfly, now quite scarce is breeding on 247.
18	1	Yes
18	2	Option A
18	3	Yes I agree that a limited number of houses could be built. Although I am very concerned about the numbers of potential housing numbers in the document. If building increased to this scale it would have significant issues to a village the size of Blyth
18	4	No preference to the site. although I am very concerned about the numbers of potential housing numbers in the document.
18	5	Traffic in the village is increasing, with many cars speeding through from the A1 towards Worksop. There has also been a significant increase in road noise from the A1 since the improvements and the removal of the roundabout.
18	6	I think where possible open spaces that are adjacent to communities are maintained to allow the rural aspects of village life to be enjoyed.
18	7	Where possible around existing sites.
18	8	No preference
19	1	Yes
19	2	None
19	3	None
19	4	87 - provided there is a community leisure facility and light industrial units incorporated
19	5	The site at the junction of Marsh Lane and Fox Covert Lane, previously the Newell Dunford engineering works, although committed to housing has remained undeveloped for many years and is a blot on the village landscape. It should be developed as a priority before other committed sites or potential sites.
19	6	Option A
19	7	Preferably in and around existing sites to limit and contain the adverse effects
19	8	Together to limit the adverse effects
20	1	I disagree, the questionnaires were not available to all residents of certain Rural Service Centres. The maps also did not show the full extent of these centres.
20	2	Option A

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
20	3	Should be nine maximum. Its important that Blyth remains a village, any more would compromise the road structure in Blyth. This is a danger to the safety of residents, especially at the cross roads.
20	4	Yes, the open spaces shown on the map should be protected from any future development. Also any open spaces available to the village outside the development boundary should be protected and shown on any future planning maps.
20	5	They should be concentrated in or around existing sites. Facilities are already in place at these sites.
20	6	Together. Why set up different sites? The expense of infrastructure would be reduced by having fewer sites.
20	7	Sites 178 or 489
20	8	Yes, they should be protected along with the cricket field.
20	9	Easier to expand existing sites than develop new ones and less impact on the environment.
21	1	Option A
21	2	Disagree. would prefer no new housing to be built to protect existing village environment
21	3	If any is essential preferred sites would be 236 & 237
21	4	Yes
21	5	In existing sites. These sites are purpose built and would cost less to expand than building new sites
21	6	Together. Keep communities together
22	1	Yes
22	2	Option A.
22	3	Yes, I agree. Although there needs to be flood defence improvements.
22	4	Poor access onto the A57.
22	5	Yes, the green within the centre of the village needs to be retained for open spaces purposes.
22	6	Yes, extending existing sites where there is already the infrastructure.
23	1	The redevelopment of Misson Mill would be favoured over any of the other sites due to this being considered brownfield land.
24	1	My husband and myself believe that Retford does not need anymore houses. There are many new homes all ready built that are still not sold, there is no money around for people to buy new homes.
24	2	None. Reason being there is far too much traffic on the roads already and Retford cant cope with more. If we really had to see a site built on, then it would be 51 & R7.
24	3	51 & R7
24	4	As I have said, the amount of traffic is a big issue for us, also the schools, doctors, dentists, Retford is not big enough and it should not be made any bigger. If you live in Retford, you will know the trouble you have getting from Ordsall into town, when Retford Oaks and St Joseph's come out it is a nightmare, even when you go onto London Road, High Street in Ordsall is difficult, when there's a problem on the A1 they come through Retford.
24	5	REMOVED
24	6	REMOVED
24	7	NOT 41
24	8	Also, there are 1700 derelict properties in Retford - What will be done with these?
24	9	What about the cut backs to police and fire service, also the fact that you are considering cutting back on street lights. I believe there has not been enough thought gone into this. You will have many more people and less police and fire service to deal with issues.
24	10	Also I spoke to someone in the know who told me that Retford needs only 15 new houses, is this true? As I said before Retford has many new homes already built and not sold.
24	11	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
24	12	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
24	13	There will be a significant loss of amenity
24	14	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
24	15	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
24	16	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
25	1	We support the Council's support for suitable allocations for economic development uses in rural areas.
25	2	We support the taking wider consideration of noise and odour of existing farm buildings when the Council is considering developments next door to these sites.
25	3	Grade 3b is not BMV land and must be excluded from the policy. Grade 3a and 3b are not the same quality.
25	4	Landscape character assessment should be used for site development and not prevent it. The policies of the 'conserve' landscape character zone should not be a way of preventing development in the area of the landscape character zone.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
26	1	I have lived in this bungalow for over 20 years since my retirement from my career in the ambulance service. I bought this bungalow for the view to the open countryside, I saved to have a conservatory built at the rear so I could enjoy the benefit of the view. Building in the area 41 would be detrimental to the environment of the town and for many residents bordering 41. Taking a great interest in our town there is plenty of agricultural land North of Retford that would not infringe on anyone and would be within walking distance of the large industrial sites, I feel as many residents feel that Ordsall has done more than its share in accommodating housing developments when is it going to stop.
27	1	Should any development take place on this land I would like to see a preservation Order put on the mature trees and hedgerow that borders the main road access into Shireoaks village.
27	2	Would prefer housing rather than industrial use - although I would like this to be not used at all. The open vista is pleasing to anyone knowing Shireoaks given the other side of the bypass is earmarked for both housing and industrial. Future development needs to consider logistical problems in size of the school and width of the roads entering the village. I do not wish that the village becomes part of Worksop and retains its village feel.
27	3	The plantation to be retained on this land rear to Claylands Avenue.
27	4	Would like to see the golf course retained as a green open space and any open space given the size of land earmarked for industrial and housing development.
27	5	Existing sites
27	6	Sites should be together
28	1	No I do not agree with the screening if the overall area is not identified by the infrastructure of the town and taking into account the new buildings that have taken place.
28	2	No I don't believe that there is a need for more houses in this town. Industrial sites have been allocated but no new industry has been bought in and it is not for the need for new housing.
28	3	51, R7, 309, 6, 69, 27, 81, 512 & 37
28	4	51 & 27
29	1	As a lay-person with regards to the planning of large housing developments, I have no knowledge of other methods. I am sure that the council have adopted the best method for identifying sites and I am happy to accept that the criteria used is suitable as I don't know any different.
29	2	I acknowledge that all parts of the local area, and indeed, the national areas require housing growth. However, I do feel that the required amount of new housing build for Tuxford is sufficient and that Tuxford should NOT be allocated additional housing above that which is already required. Tuxford is not large enough to cope with too many new residents. The road network and local facilities can sometimes reach their capacities as it is now. Any additional housing will affect that anyway, so for that reason I don't think Tuxford needs more.
29	3	Looking at the map of Tuxford provided, it seems that the potential sites 121, 122 & 490 offer the best locations for additional housing. Whether they are all needed and whether they need to be that large are questions. Perhaps all 3 sites used but reduced in size or just 2 of those sites used for building would be more suitable?
29	4	The sites mentioned above (121, 122 & 490) look to be in ideal locations. Not only do they appear to not affect existing residents too much, but they also benefit from the bigger and better road network leading in and out. That said, I think it would be ESSENTIAL to control the junction of Ashvale Road/Lincoln Road with traffic lights. These should work on a timer system during peak times and a sensor system during off-peak times. That junction will cause many problems if left as a Give Way junction. Likewise, the speed limit of 30mph needs to be extended up to this this junction.
29	5	Yes I do. The open spaces identified on the map should remain that way. They are need for schools and recreation, some of them are clearly of historical interest.
29	6	Option A
29	7	I don't really know what is best. It would seem to make more sense to expand existing sites rather than build new ones.
29	8	I have no personal preference.
29	9	I don't know of any.
30	1	423 within Mattersey, the Eastern side of this field regularly floods so would seem to be unsuitable for any kind of housing development.
31	1	Yes
31	2	Option A
31	3	I perhaps would just like to see natural development of current houses but understand the limitations. So I would accept up to 11 houses being built but would not want to accept an 'estate' build rather a small dedicated area that fitted in with the village layout.
31	4	Ref 461 tagged on the end of the village on Leverton Road, following the current line of houses, matching up on both sides.
31	5	Need to be aware of flooding issues within the centre of the village. The school is currently full but places would have to be created if there were new houses built. This village would like to develop a green strategy and encourage or dictate, that all new homes would incur green energy as part of their plans.
31	6	Of course, they should, this is a village and huge development would change the whole structure and layout. The residents here want a village feel not a sprawling mass of houses, they want to protect their outlook and views, this is partly why they live here, the open aspect is a thing to treasure, thus the up in arms about the wind farm planning applications.
31	7	Thought we already had sufficient, but would go with existing sites.
31	8	Together, as probably already familiar to the travellers and would seem to be doubling up of amenities.
32	1	Option A
32	2	I agree with the above that 14 new houses between now and 2028 would be adequate for the village size and the amenities that we have at present. It would change the nature of the village if more was to be built and it would change into an urban sprawl ruining the character and reducing the quality of life for the existing residents.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
32	3	Reference no 442 this a large area but would be ideal for a small scale development of just 14 houses. The 14 houses that have been suggested could be built one by one throughout the village therefore making much less of an intrusion or impact on the already rural area which we would like to keep we do not want to end up as an urban sprawl such as what has happened to Beckingham which has lost all its identity.
32	4	Number 346 this area is already being developed as up to today we as residents are not aware of any planning permission that has been applied for on this area of land. We see that it is a site allocated for potential building on but it looks as though the landowner knows more then us can you enlighten us as to why he is being allowed to prepare the site for building when we who live near to it have not been informed. There has already been a clearing of mature trees, hedgerows and an inroad into the field from the road is well advanced. We object to this disruption without prior warning or consultation.
32	5	Yes i do think they should be protected and suggest land off Brickenhole Lane from the property Westleigh to the next Detached house on the right hand side just before the entrance to the village. This should be protected also as a Wildlife site as it supports a diversity of common mammals, Bird life and Fauna and Flora that is absent within the village. Also because we are surrounded by farmland this tends to become sterile with regards to wildlife due to the intensive farming methods adapted today by farmers. The shooting fraternity also destroy game birds and anything else that flies over the fields and this particular area gives them a sanctuary in which to breed and survive without this the area would be devoid of any natural wildlife and each village should a haven/area or opportunity to nurture there wildlife .
32	6	I do not know of any sites suitable for this development within this area.
32	7	I do no know sufficient about this to comment.
32	8	I do not know of any sites within the village that could accommodate this development
33	1	We do not think out town need any more housing. Most new properties are standing vacant - its putting more strain on services. Retford us just a bottle neck. More money should be spent on making busy roads safer. When the children are leaving Carr Hill school its a danger zone at the top of Tiln Lane. There should be a mini roundabout. Retford should be kept as an historic town. Although our Council tax has been frozen for the last two years, its still one of the highest in the country. Is this where money is going - to keep building houses?
33	2	We do not agree with number 533 on the map. As a resident on Durham Grove, we think it is very unfair of Mr John Lacey to try to get access to build new homes at the bottom of Durham Grove when he has got enough land of his own to provide access. Some of the residents have disabilities and feel safe in the environment. Parking is also an issue. If large vehicles come down they have to reverse out. There is only room for single file traffic. With more wanting access it would be chaos.
33	3	The road is very narrow and when it rains water pools from one side of the road to the other as the drains don't take it away. This is a flood risk.
33	4	When it rains heavily the water stands across the width of the road, because the drains are slow to take it away and the road is extremely narrow with a blind corner. It is extremely dangerous for lorries and traffic.
33	5	In Retford there have been plenty of new houses built and half of them stand empty. What is the Council thinking? Why do we need all these houses to put strain on our services?
34	1	Yes we agree
34	2	Option A
34	3	We agree for at least 11 houses.
34	4	Yes. We think 33 houses are too many on site 247.
34	5	Would prefer to see site 248 developed in the future.
34	6	No.
34	7	Yes.
34	8	Can't comment. Not aware of existing sites.
34	9	REMOVED
34	10	Not aware of any.
35	1	I would prefer to see development on sites 296, 345, 406, 407 and 477 as they front busy roads and face existing developments.
35	2	Access to the proposed development site 408 is not possible. The strip of land along Croft Way, bordering this site, is owned by a private individual who does not wish to sell it or grant access across it. In the absence of any other feasible access, site 408 is unsuitable for development.
36	1	Five affordable houses as the most. No community facilities for a shop, health service, doctor's surgery or post office. Road infrastructure not suitable for any more traffic.
36	2	No, my view would not change.
36	3	484, 406, 477
36	4	Yes.
37	1	Not sure
37	2	Option A
37	3	There was only a 21.68% response rate from the questionnaires issued. Should residents have realised this figure was going to be based on those results you may have had a better response therefore a more comprehensive idea on residents feelings. 12 new houses spread between the two villages seems adequate

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
37	4	Yes definitely, I can't see how 19 houses can be built on that land that doesn't include flats or very small houses - not the right image for a village like Hayton, which rightly retains a premium on house prices. Plus that junction at the end would become dangerous.
37	5	161, 544, 545. Basically the smaller sites that would allow for individual dwellings rather than small developments.
37	6	Currently we have 3 public houses, when at any given time only 2 manage to prosper. The Boat would do better as a B&B. There still isn't a local shop, post office or cafe. Perhaps look at the church for dual purpose.
37	7	Yes, although not much allocated to Hayton
37	8	REMOVED
37	9	Not at all
37	10	REMOVED
38	1	Yes but I think you should have added a master plan criteria about relationship of the site with existing built fabric of the village (many of the sites you consider developable are too remote from the villages) and the criteria should have been weighted so the scoring of sites against the criteria could be transparent and objective.
38	2	Option A
38	3	No, given that there is only local support for 12 houses in the plan period allocating new land for housing is not warranted, the 12 units will be provided by windfall development. There are still a number of disused barns and land within the village boundary which come forward for development when the property market recovers.
38	4	238 on the basis that is the smallest site which can be contained, to its' proximity to the sewerage pumping station, can be accessed from an existing road and does not constitute backland development.
38	5	It will be impossible to limit the number of houses on sites 239,464,and 237/236 if they were allocated. Developer will require additional units to fund the required access and infrastructure improvements. Site 239 is now in the Conservation area if allocated this site would totally undermine the integrity of the development boundary and subsequently the character of the village.
38	6	Yes
38	7	The land adjacent to Trent Port should be considered given that this suffers from illegal Traveller occupation and fly tipping.
38	8	I do not understand the requirements of the occupants so wouldn't presume advise.
39	1	Option A
39	2	I agree that 9 houses should be allocated in Blyth.
39	3	For minimum disruption to local residents, for nine houses it would be beneficial for sites 178 to be developed first. 178 has capacity for 20 houses so has room for further development. Site 178 also has minimal residential houses nearby so would have less of an effect on current residents.
39	4	Site 266 is a vital area for walkers and dog walkers. This is an area for people to use for family picnics and is a great space for children to play.
39	5	In and around existing sites. The site is already there so it would be less of an environmental impact to develop the existing site further.
39	6	Together. It makes more sense to have them this way due to the cost incurred by having them separate.
40	1	Yes, I believe the current criterion is appropriate.
40	2	Option A.
40	3	No, the flood risk combined with the poor road access on the A57 should really be considered as major constraints to any further development in central Dunham.
40	4	No.
40	5	I agree that the current open spaces within Dunham should be retained and I support their protection. Particularly the Green.
40	6	Existing sites.
41	1	Yes. I agree with the overall methodology.
41	2	Option A
41	3	No, now we have the Corner Farm permission for 19, there should be no further growth within the village. The villages infrastructure and school cannot take any further growth unless we get a school extension or a bypass. Plus the shop and pub have now closed. WE DO NOT SUPPORT ANY FUTURE HOUSING ALLOCATIONS IN THE VILLAGE.
41	4	No, now we have the Corner Farm permission for 19, there should be no further growth within the village. The villages infrastructure and school cannot take any further growth unless we get a school extension or a bypass. Plus the shop and pub have now closed. WE DO NOT SUPPORT ANY FUTURE HOUSING ALLOCATIONS IN THE VILLAGE.
41	5	The Corner Farm site as this now has planning permission. No others.
41	6	There has been recent flooding issues within the village, which your flooding maps do not highlight. In addition, the main through road in Clarbrough is now too busy and congested. The recent developments are also altering the existing character of Hayton in particular.
41	7	Yes, I think protecting open spaces within the village is a positive thing and I praise the Council for considering this.
41	8	I believe extending existing sites where there is already the correct infrastructure is the best option. If the Council has to look at other sites, then maybe redundant brownfield sites could be considered??

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
41	9	I think they should be provided together.
42	1	Option A
42	2	No. More housing needs to be built, including 50% low cost housing, at least double the number allocated.
42	3	No, that is an existing approval.
42	4	170 and 258
42	5	The need of a shop/post office. Perhaps assistance should be given to reopen the pub with these facilities added on. Hayton has no shop neither Welham.
42	6	The area occupied by the village hall and its surrounds designated as an open space.
42	7	Concentrated in or on extensions of existing sites
42	8	Together
43	1	I think that Criterion 4: Will the site result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land? should also encompass the criteria recognised by the SHLAA as listed below especially the position of the Chesterfield canal (within Hayton) and its position as a SSSI. If this is to be taken into account then there are 3 sites (161,160,170) that cannot be included in high capacity housing development as they border the canal side and would not meet even initial screening parameters for suitability of the sites (see para 2.6).
43	2	Option A
43	3	Corner Farm already has preliminary planning permission for 21 houses. Firstly I strongly believe that 21 house on that site is wildly inappropriate and would result in insurmountable traffic and infrastructure problems 12 -14 houses would be far more appropriate and would produce a more desirable development that would be more attractive to future house owners and in keeping with the environs. If you are asking do we need another additional 12 houses on top of Corner Farm development within Hayton in the next 12 years then I would say no to dense development but linear development which is the historical norm for the village would be acceptable even desirable and in this case I think the out-dated and frankly unworkable village envelope should be scrapped as a development screening tool to allow this. Development along the canal side is untenable and should be ruled out at the first opportunity.
43	4	Please see answer above to Q45. I restate that I am not opposed to the development of Corn Farm but at a lower density and would prefer that Corner Farm development be viewed as Hayton's contribution to additional local housing for the future.
43	5	None
43	6	Any high density development within Hayton is not what is wanted locally as the council officers can attest to following the substantial public turn out at our recent meeting. - the concern is that although it is obvious that Hayton resident do not want significant development within the village this sentiment will somehow be ignored by the council planning dept when developers come flashing money. I would strongly fight any such inappropriate planning applications. And I am sure that Bassetlaw does not want to end up in the same situation as Wakefield falling foul of a High Court Ruling.
43	7	Yes all the open spaces should remain protected they are vital to the well being and happiness of local residents.
43	8	Development of existing sites seems sensible if you spread the load you spread the distress for local residents.
43	9	REMOVED
43	10	I know of none.
44	1	Yes
44	2	Option A
44	3	No, 12 houses represent the maximum development between 2012-2028 the village has insufficient infra-structure for any development in excess of this.
44	4	238, is the most suitable option given its' proximity to the local sewerage plant and drainage infra-structure. Together with minimal loss of amenity to the residents of Top Pasture Lane.
44	5	Yes, these will be covered by a separate letter detailing the concerns of the residents on the south side of Low Street.
44	6	Yes
44	7	I do not believe that we need any further Traveller sites in the district.
44	8	Together.
45	1	Yes
45	2	Option A
45	3	There may be a need for a small number of houses suitable for the ageing population. This should be restricted to a MAXIMUM of 11 new houses, not "at least 11" as stated above.
45	4	Site reference number 461 (Part of) This should be restricted to small scale development as close to the village amenities,(pub, Village Hall, Church) as possible.
45	5	Agree
45	6	Existing official sites only. Current agricultural land should be protected from use as camp sites.
45	7	Should be together in order to control the costs and limit the degradation of the local environment.
46	1	Yes
46	2	Option A
46	3	No further development required. We have 41 houses planned for on the 2 sisters factory and then a further 26 private house developments/plans

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
46	4	I don't believe there is a requirement for further development
46	5	The village infrastructure (schools, sewage, broadband, power supply, gas etc.) needs to be updated and improved before any additional dwellings are considered!
46	6	As stated above. There is sufficient development underway within the village. As such space should be saved as open spaces.
46	7	No development
46	8	No further development
47	1	Option A
47	2	Due to the number of houses already for sale within the area that are not being sold, I do not think that more housing is required. The village does not have the facilities or infrastructure to accommodate more houses and people.
47	3	No I still think that the infrastructure would still be inadequate.
47	4	I do not want to see any of the sites developed at the moment.
47	5	The plot no 258 and 170 is used by the local community for recreational purposes and for watching nature and wildlife. If this was to be built on then a vast number of animals would be disturbed. It is also an area where children can play quite safely away from traffic. Due to the roads not being joined then traffic has to go around via the main road. Drainage, school, lack of amenities for residents already. Bus service that stops in the early evening.
47	6	I think that these plots in particular should be protected in the future for the above mentioned reasons. Also the fact that this end of Clarborough flooded 5 year ago causing damage to quite a number of homes. If this particular field is built on then it is more water that will have to be taken care of by an already inadequate drainage system. This will if not done correctly leave the rest of Clarborough at risk of flood.
48	1	Don't know as we were not included in this. I was actually informed by someone of the meeting from a resident in Hayton.
48	2	Option A
48	3	I think if building is necessary I believe that a maximum of 12 houses should be built.
48	4	If 19 houses are built on corner farm I think that is enough for a small village and the facilities it has to offer.
48	5	Corner farm 171, as we are not losing the green countryside and disturbing wildlife. I think that the sites 258 and 170 are far too big. The village is not big enough and does not have enough facilities. In building on these sites you are affecting the residents that already live here, I don't think consideration has been given to the children who live and play in the village and already attend a SMALL village school. I also think we are going to be creating flooding issues, water already collects at the end of St Johns drive, if the fields are built on, there will be no where for the water to drain (this will not be cost effective if the whole village suffers from water damage).
48	6	Lack of amenities - A bus service that finishes at 6pm, a small village school, drainage and flooding, thought to wildlife and green areas where children can play and explore safely. Building more roads through the village puts the children who already reside here at danger.
48	7	Yes I do believe that 170 and 258 should be protected, this is beautiful land that hosts much wildlife. It is important for children to have areas of land where they can explore and discover, we are continually encouraging children to be environmentally friendly, I don't think building on any piece of green land available is encouraging them to appreciate and respect nature.
49	1	I can't comment either way, because the construct of the questions, the interpretation of responses and the degree of weight/impact assigned to responses by Planning professionals and politicians, both local and national, is not known to me. I don't have the same 'reference framework' as they, I just live in Retford and see and experience the effect of 'planning'. For example, missing from the plan consultation is the 'social/affordable housing' placement; be in no doubt, this category blights same proximity area simply because the occupants/owners have little or no pride/incentive/motivation to maintain/invest in their housing. Concentrating 'social housing' in one location will simply create a 'stay away ghetto' reputation.
49	2	No, I don't. Retford is a small market/agricultural town, that has attracted retirees and still does (migration from the south). That's its character. No amount of housing or insignificant (sub 150 employee, service sector) employment growth will change that.
49	3	1, 3, 7, 24, 37, 40, 41, 44, 46, 51, 52, 69, 309, 370, 488, 489, 511, 512, 571, 572, R6, R7.
49	4	259, R2
49	5	50% of 259/R2 should be Employment with 50% of 364 allocated as open space to provide a buffer between employment and housing. I believe that creating a large housing area (as per the 259/R2 proposal) without any nearby employment, is not diversification.
49	6	Typically, twice each working day, there will be a large number of people leave the housing area by car with the attendant transport congestion, and then return to the housing area at the end of the working day. As the plan stands, 259/R2 will need additional public transport because it's too far to walk to rail, into Retford town centre, or to any Retford industrial estates. My observation of the Hallcroft and Randall Way industrial estates is one of constant heavy lorry traffic at unsociable hours. At the moment, the buffer between these industrial estates and the housing is simply the roads.
49	7	51/511/572/R6/R7 should be 70% housing and 20% employment, and 10% as a buffer between housing and employment (industrial estates).
49	8	There is nothing in the plan about a vision for Retford. I came to live in Retford because it has excellent Rail and A1 road access, it was a small market/agricultural town that didn't have a heavy industrial base, it has the gem of open space in the centre called Kings Park, it has a good secondary school. Retford still reminds me of where Newark-on-Trent was 15 years ago. Newark has used its East coast rail line asset to attract London commuters (higher disposable income) and it shows when walking around Newark centre and driving through its suburbs. Retford can't survive on retirees, social housing tenants/organisations, small scale retail/service jobs - an introverted approach. It needs a vision, an aspiration.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
49	9	Yes, especially Kings Park. I'd also like to see the North Road and Babworth Road cemeteries designated as open space. They are as much an 'open space' asset as Kings Park.
49	10	Yes, possibly as lightly wooded open space communal play areas.
49	11	They cant be used for industrial because of the existing roads aren't 'big' enough.
49	12	Option A
49	13	REMOVED
49	14	I don't understand the difference between the two.
49	15	REMOVED
50	1	Yes
50	2	Option A
50	3	Yes, I agree that there should be further housing in the future. I support future housing on site 228 or 483.
50	4	228 and/or 483.
50	5	I agree that open spaces should be protected as part of this process. Site 38/1 is regularly used and should be retained as a playing field.
50	6	Existing Sites.
50	7	Together where all the major infrastructure is located.
51	1	Yes
51	2	Option A
51	3	Yes, as this is a 15 year plan we need more homes to support our school, pub and post office.
51	4	462, 460 and 461 as they could be natural extensions to the village.
51	5	The centre of the village is prone to flooding issues.
51	6	I fully support the protection of the village play area (site 46/2) it is well used and should be retained.
51	7	Existing Sites, but new sites if there is no further capacity on existing ones.
51	8	Together - close to facilities.
52	1	I do not agree with the criteria in the Screening Methodology for the village of Elkesley.
52	2	Option A
52	3	Yes, but only for first-time buyers (affordable and 2 bedroom bungalows for senior citizens
52	4	Yes, because Yew Tree Road cannot take anymore vehicles and for the safety of young children travelling to the new play area.
52	5	Site 248 or 249.
52	6	Para 2.5 (Page 10) Plot no. 247 is not brownfield but greenfield and is also outside of the development boundary. Para. 2.6, "Suitability of the Site", items 2, 4, 5, and 7 are all against the development of site 247. Para. 2.9 (Page 11) Employment - Elkesley has no potential employment at all. Everyone who works will have to use their own transport. Para. 2.11, This is very true about the village of Elkesley. Para. 2.21 (Page 13) - How can Elkesley be classed as a Rural Service Centre? Para. 2.25 - 'A'. Para. 2.29 (Page 14) - 'A'. Para. 2.30 - Not on greenfield when we have brownfield available. Para. 2.37 and 2.38 (Page 16) - 'R'.
52	7	Elkesley shouldn't be classed as a Rural Service Centre 1) The pub may be closing; 2)We have no post office; 3)The local shop is only a convenience store and the residents have to travel to larger towns; 4) We would like a communal garden with seats, a bowling green and tennis courts on the greenfield site.
52	8	Yes.
52	9	No, we already have 20 social houses on Yew tree now.
52	10	Option A
52	11	The first part, yes - if it included 2-bed bungalows for downsizing. But only when the bridge over the A1 is completed.
52	12	No development of 33 properties should be built off Yew Tree Road, because the road from Yew Tree cannot take another estimated 82 vehicles per day
52	13	248 and 249
52	14	Only that we do not have a post office which makes this a serious problem for a lot of residents - i.e. OAPs
52	15	Yes, site 247 should be protected as a heritage site
52	16	Elkesley should not be classed as a Rural Service Centre because the local shop is only a convenience store; the school is just about full to capacity; we do not have a doctors surgery or health centre. The [bus] service is very poor to and from Retford/Worksop - how do the residents with no transport get to Bassetlaw Hospital?
52	17	No development should even be looked at until the A1 is completed. Where the jobs in Elkesley? Residents will have to travel by car.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
53	1	We feel we must stress our concerns and total opposition to any form of development at this location (Site 69, off Welham Road) either now or in the long term future. The land has become a haven for wildlife over a long period of time with natural regeneration of the flora and fauna and has buzzards, kestrels, sparrow hawks and barn owls hunting over the meadows. The land also borders the Chesterfield Canal and sightings of kingfisher, heron, cormorant and water vole (an endangered species) are regularly seen. We feel that any form of development would be detrimental to the ecology of the vicinity.
53	2	Furthermore, we feel that more than ample development has already taken place and is still taking place in and around Retford with many of those developments not being fully occupied. We also feel that infrastructure of Retford itself cannot sustain much more development in what are already built up areas.
54	1	Castle Hill, Grove Wood and Little Gringley. Highest elevated landscape seen from the east of Retford - much appreciated by individuals and groups of Ramblers and also by the boat people on the canal, thus attracting tourism. This area is an important green wedge of land into the east of the town and is visually important to users of the canal towpath and for views from Leverton Road.
54	2	The land has a wealth of flora and fauna which is of benefit to the community and to the residents of Retford as a whole. The rough land is almost a nature reserve and, as a member of Nott's Wildlife Trust, I think it should be protected. The undisturbed land attracts birds, e.g. barn Owls hunting for field voles, kestrels herons and many migrating birds in winter, plus occasional foxes, pheasants and many species of butterfly and moths.
54	3	The land is lowlying, often damp and waterlogged, which would be likely to prove to be difficult to service for drainage, foul and surface water. Parts of the clay land flood in winter. Lessons should be learnt from the development on Blackstope Lane and Chesterfield Drive and the severe floods a couple of years ago, when some residents had to move to other accommodation for over a year. Also, the drainage problems at the eastern end of Bracken Lane, Grove coach Road development.
54	4	Access to the site would need to be from the layby close to the Hop Pole public house and add to traffic with access onto the Welham Road at the detriment to and danger of current users of Welham Road.
54	5	Houses on Brixworth Way have mostly been built with small gardens to the rear and with current planning guidelines for higher density housing, would be likely to result in many of those houses in Brixworth Way being overlooked by houses possibly much higher than theirs.
54	6	Further to my previous letter concerning the land at the rear of my house, in which I mentioned the low-lying, waterlogged, clay ground which floods after heavy rain and in particular after heavy snow.
54	7	My son has sent me a flood map from the EA in which it shows the land as the extent of severe flood - this after a neighbour had made enquiries from planning that it was shown as low risk. According to OED 'extreme' is reaching high or the highest degree. Hardly low risk. As I said in my previous letter, surely the houses off Grove Lane have proved what can happen on low ground.
55	1	Not familiar with this.
55	2	A
55	3	I would prefer no houses. The current amenities are already inadequate for the exiting population, e.g. school too small, no doctor's surgery, no facilities for teenagers.
55	4	No. The dwellings at Corner Farm could have been sympathetically developed as a social amenity/facility. A museum in honour of Revd Metcalfe would have been appropriate.
55	5	Sites 453 and 296 should be protected open space or amenities for the whole village.
55	6	The questionnaire I saw promoted development of housing on sites 453 and 296. I feel this land at the heart of the village should be utilised as an area of social amenity significance, not housing.
55	7	Only an idiot would build houses on a playing field and a playground that had only recently been installed at vast cost. To build on open space would be irresponsible in the extreme.
55	8	Existing sites - potentially less disruption.
56	1	Yes.
56	2	Option B: Harworth and Bircotes
56	3	No. In my opinion enough houses have already been allowed in Ranskill adding not only extra traffic on the side roads, but also increased traffic through the village. If any more housing is permitted, no more than ten at the very most.
56	4	Site 537. This site, in my opinion, would be in easy walking distance from local amenities, a bus stop, shop, public house and of course primary school and village park. A good road is already in place and access would either be from Station Road or access lane on to Mattersey Road.
57	1	No Comment
57	2	Option A
57	3	Yes
57	4	294 or parts of 438 and 468 alongside existing roads
57	5	Should be affordable housing in keeping with existing structures not like the school developments
57	6	Yes
57	7	Existing to afford families maintain links
57	8	Residential pitches only as transit ones do not allow for families to put down roots.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
58	1	We wish to offer our support to the new proposed site at the village hall for the village hall for the village public house in preference to the approved site on Station road. We were amongst the people who objected strongly to the site on Station Road on the grounds that the public house was never going to be built, but was just a rouse to acquire planning permission to open the land for building. The landowner is now promoting this site for housing development as predicted.
58	2	We disagree, on the grounds that Beckingham already has had in recent years 3 new building sites in the Station Road, Low street area. The Rotunda replaced by 9 houses (Willow Mews) and the Nursery replaced by 4 houses. At the present time 10 new houses are still for sale.
58	3	If development is to continue in the village, although at the present time, we can see no reason for this given the economic climate of the country at the moment, surely it would be more logical to build on small plots, to fill in, rather than a large built estate.
58	4	When site 106, applied for planning permission, the clerk of the village Council did all the applications, at no point was the land owner mentioned. Now that planning has been granted, we are now being encouraged by the same people who championed the Public House to be built on Station Road, to now write to Bassetlaw saying we want the Public House to now be moved to the recreation ground and the land owner is now championing that the public house field 106, should be considered for housing development of 63 houses.
58	5	If a public house is to be built on 106, I think it should be adopted by the village, and the rest of the land should be left for sheep grazing as it is now.
58	6	If we're not careful, future generations will not know what countryside is and village life will no longer exist. We will become a small town.
58	7	Enclosed my letters of objections which have lots of objections to building on plot 106. A fuel aviation line runs through this field underground.
58	8	I think that sites 106, 101, 451 should be protected from future development. If these larger sites were built on it would put lots of added pressure on the school, play group and roads.
58	9	There are very few facilities in Beckingham for the under 5s and even older children.
58	10	The cycle track is now closed. If more houses are to be built, give Beckingham the facilities to go with them.
58	11	The site is very close to an extremely busy road junction at Station Road leading to Old Trent Road. The amount of added traffic to a public house would greatly add to a conservative estimate of 400-500 vehicle movements per day at present, this figure is EXCLUSIVE to Agricultural traffic movements which are considerable. There are bus stops on both sides of the road at this busy junction which are serviced by school buses morning and afternoon. It is obvious therefore that if permitted it would be to the detriment of road safety and would conflict with THE BASSETLAW LOCAL PLAN POLICY 5/3. It is also a no through road, so all traffic that goes down Station Road need to return to the busy Station Road junction.
58	12	It is well known that Public Houses are frequently areas of civil disturbance i.e. NOISE, ARGUMENTS BETWEEN INTOXICATED CUSTOMERS LEADING TO FIGHTS AND VANDALISM. IT IS ALSO WELL KNOWN THAT ALCOHOL IS DETRIMENTAL TO HEALTH AND LEADS TO MEDICAL PROBLEMS WHICH ARE DIFFICULT AND EXPENSIVE TO TREAT.
58	13	Village and Town Public Houses are closing at the rate of 30+ per week, so how could it be justifiable to build another in this economic climate?
58	14	Over the last few years, one public house in a neighbouring village has been demolished, and another has closed. The village public house in Beckingham, before it closed down due to lack of support, was known to serve under age persons and drugs were also available.
59	1	I feel the site suggested for the pub would be better as it would be easier to access from the main road and would fit better into the surroundings better. We do need a pub whether it be the first or second site suggested.
60	1	We feel the first site for the pub would be preferable as it has better access from the main road for passing trade and fits in better.
61	1	We are pleased to hear that approval has been given for a public house/restaurant to be built in Beckingham. However, we are writing to express our disapproval of this application being for a site in Station Road. We would ask the Council reconsiders the original request for the public house to be built on a site close to the village hall and roundabout on the edge of the village. This site would cause the least disruption to residents and would be more accessible to villages. The considerable work carried out to the village hall over recent years has given the village a vibrant social area and it surely makes sense to include any public house/restaurant within the same area.
61	2	The Willow Works
61	3	Option B
61	4	Are you meaning 6 new houses or 6 new housing developments. We would rather no new housing until current vacant properties have been taken up. However, 6 new houses might be acceptable, us certainly not 6 new housing developments.
61	5	496 and 497
61	6	Should not be used for either PH or housing developments
61	7	Yes, definitely. Including village green not shown on plan as potential open space
61	8	Keep in existing sites - More economic sense
61	9	Together
62	1	Yes.
62	2	I agree that Tuxford should see extra housing in the future.
62	3	Sites 123, 122, 117
62	4	Sites 490, 121, 115, 124 and 130 should not be developed due to these being considered unsustainable and the infrastructure is not adequate enough. Site 490 is also currently farmland and this should be protected from any built development.
62	5	I agree that the villages central open space should be protected.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
62	6	Option A
63	1	Yes.
63	2	Option A.
63	3	I agree that at least five new homes should be built in Gamston over the next five years.
63	4	Site 410 should have the opportunity to be redeveloped.
63	5	Gamston does have major access issues from the main road into Retford. In addition, there are flooding and drainage issues off Rectory Road from the River Idle.
63	6	I agree that the open spaces should be protected from future development.
63	7	I agree that this site should be developed, but the listed building should be retained on site.
63	8	Existing sites.
64	1	Yes. The methodology does consider a number of appropriate issues.
64	2	Option A
64	3	No, I disagree, planning permission has been given for Corner Farm and this would effectively allocate the 12 houses suggested by residents in March. I believe the village does not need any further housing.
64	4	The redevelopment of Corner Farm more than accommodates the 12 houses stated in question 1.
64	5	Sites 170 and 258 have significant drainage, flooding and access issues and any future growth would increase these problems.
64	6	Flooding on sites 170 and 258 should be considered as since 2007, the sites have flooded at least 4 times. In addition, the new school is full to capacity and would not support any future housing.
64	7	All open spaces should be protected.
64	8	No new sites in Clarborough Hayton please.
64	9	Together.
65	1	Yes, this seems appropriate.
65	2	Option A
65	3	Yes, I believe that the village should see new housing to sustain the current shop, school and public house.
65	4	Site 483 would be considered an appropriate site to accommodate future development growth.
65	5	The village playing field should be protected.
66	1	Definitely no more allocation of housing than is planned.
66	2	69, 6, 3, 27, 370, 511, 46, 309 and 41
66	3	51 R7
66	4	As with all potential housing sites, the road system at present is inadequate. If houses were built at 37-512 the Tiln Lane is inadequate to support any more traffic. Especially at the junction with Moorgate.
66	5	If houses were built at 1, 40, 41 and 52 it would cause an immediate bottleneck into town. Either at the junction of High Street and Goosemoor Lane (bridge) or where Ordsall Road meets Babworth Road. Smeath Road and Tiln Lane is no a major road used by heavy traffic which avoids the Bridge at Welham Road.
66	6	Ordsall could do with a road link south – to link up with London Road. And/or an upgrade of West Hill Road out of Ordsall if brown sites are developed.
66	7	A new road is needed from London Road south to link with Clarborough south.
66	8	REMOVED
66	9	Yes I do.
66	10	Areas 1/78, 1/25 and 1/77 should be developed as nature reserves possibly.
66	11	Area 1/81 could be developed into a visitors/picnic area.
66	12	Area 1/79 could be ideal for nature conservation area alongside the river.
66	13	Areas 1/21, 1/22 and 1/23 could be developed as a sports area, children's activities, skate park.
67	1	Yes
67	2	Option A - Spread between Retford, Worksop and Harworth
67	3	I agree that land should be allocated for about 12 Houses, These should all be affordable 2 and 3 bedroomed properties on sizable plots of land.
67	4	The future development should be on sites 236 and 237
67	5	The green open spaces shown on the map should all be protected. I also think that the area round st Helens churchyard in South Wheatley should be protected as open space.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
68	1	We would, however, like to object to the inclusion of the area of land which we believe is shown as area 69 for potential residential development on your plan. This area is to the south of all of the properties on Brixworth Way and is on the opposite side of the Chesterfield Canal. We are unable to comment on other areas for the reason there is difficulty reading the plan. Our reasons for objection to this area are as follows. This area is an important green wedge of land into the east of the town and is visually important to users of the canal towpath and for views from Leverton Road
68	2	The land has a significant wealth of flora and fauna which is of benefit to the community and to the residents of Retford as a whole
68	3	The land is low lying, often damp and waterlogged, which would be likely to prove to be difficult to service for drainage, both foul and surface water
68	4	Access to the site would need to be from the layby close to the Hop Pole public house and add to the traffic with access onto the Welham Road at the detriment to and the danger of current users of Welham Road
68	5	Houses on Brixworth Way have mostly been built with very small gardens to the rear and with current planning guidelines for higher density housing, would be likely to result in many of those houses in Brixworth Way being overlooked by houses possibly much higher than theirs
68	6	However, I am pleased to see the Council have placed importance on open space in the document. Open space can be defined as land left open for public use or land most importantly in area 69 land which should be left as open space for its importance for its flora and fauna.
68	7	My first objection was regarding the green wedge. I have now seen the Council's policy document and I see the policy is to restrict development which would have an adverse effect on the amenity of the Chesterfield Canal and the River Idle. This is the situation in this case and as such the site should be rejected
68	8	The land does have a wealth of flora and fauna. These include Newts, protected under European law, certain Owls and Voles protected under British law. Also I understand there are snakes on the land but I have been unable to confirm if there are Adders which are also protected under British law. Further investigations are required by the Wildlife Trust on this point. In addition to these, there is an abundance of other species on the land, some of which may also be protected. I have also had a conversation with someone with knowledge of flora who has said they have not looked on the land but have viewed from a distance and he considers the appearance of the land to be correct for a certain type of orchid which is also protected by law. There are strong reasons here to reject this site.
68	9	The land is low lying and I have now seen the plan showing a fair proportion of the land is in extreme danger of flooding. All of the land is low lying and is often waterlogged. If developed the problem of flooding or waterlogging would be made worse on the land or passed onto other areas of land, of which, some may already be developed. Another strong reason to reject this site
68	10	I see from the plan the number of houses possible is rather high compared with some other areas of land, which does indicate a high density of development. This will significantly affect the amount of traffic onto Welham Road with a significant increase in traffic dangers. Another strong reason to reject this site.
68	11	The point mentioned about density in 4 above will also have a significant effect on residents of Brixworth Way as houses in Brixworth Way all have small rear gardens and high density in modern planning terms tends to mean three storey housing and sometimes flats, possibly even higher. This would have a significant effect on the amenities of residents of Brixworth Way and as such is another strong reason to reject this site.
69	1	With a lot of elderly people in the village they will require postal information about any potential changes to give them a voice as the majority are not on the internet.
69	2	Option A

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
69	3	I disagree it would have too greater impact on the community especially if there are lots of children as the village is very isolated with nothing for them to do. I believe 2 is ample so not significantly change the nature of our quiet, close nit community of which many are very old.
69	4	I would prefer the house to be built opposite the church site 398 and 399 not on any of the other sites. Building in Cuckney site 303 opposite the old people bungalows will greatly impact on life in the area. Our garden would be very easily accessed if there were houses, there threatening our safety and privacy. Noise levels would increase greatly as the village is very quiet if undesirables were there old people would be fearful to walk around the village
69	5	There is only one shop and there are very few buses in the village. School cars park all the way up the road morning and night on school days and house access will be very difficult and dangerous.
69	6	Yes. 303 it was allotments and will be again. Parking on Creswell Road with school traffic will make it even more dangerous.
69	7	REMOVED
69	8	Not Sure
69	9	None
70	1	No more houses on stilts
70	2	No more mobile homes
70	3	Home Farm was allocated in the past for houses, why not now? Upper Row is out of the flood line, build more houses there.
71	1	Significant impact on wildlife habitat. The proposal for housing would have serious consequences for wildlife
71	2	Significant visual impact in an area of outstanding character. I object to the proposal due to the size, nature, and location of this project, with its significant effects in terms of the visual intrusion.
71	3	Probability of noise pollution. The potential impacts this would have on the environment
71	4	Flooding. The proposal for dwellings is in a flood plain and on a site that has regularly flooded in the past and that may be expected to suffer more severe flooding in the future.
72	1	Not sure
72	2	Option A
72	3	You say "at least 12 houses" but fail to say the maximum number. What is the maximum number as this is vital information, without which the question can not be answered, as we do not have all the information.
72	4	Yes, more traffic, more school places required, entry and exit on a dangerous corner by Clarborough Hill
72	5	Depending on the "at least 12" question the Corner Farm site is better, but NOT both sites.
72	6	Yes, the field / area at the end of Broad Gorse should be protected.
72	7	I think existing sites should be used and enhanced.
72	8	Together, as this is an efficient way of delivering services when money is so short.
72	9	None
73	1	The screening methodology is too shallow and does not take into account the whole issue of development - for example there is no mention of local amenities - shops, schools, infrastructure or consequences of development on existing facilities
73	2	Option A
73	3	As there has been outline planning granted for 21 dwellings on Lanes Corner Farm then this should conclude and fill the entire allocation for Hayton/Clarborough
73	4	No - If the total allocation for Hayton/Clarborough is 12 AND the Corner Farm proposal is accepted then that should be the total.
73	5	None
73	6	I would like to see any proposals for improvement in roads/infrastructure and amenities that would improve the area before adding more housing.
73	7	Agree
73	8	REMOVED
73	9	Together so they can be better policed
73	10	None
74	1	The concerns that I have for any future development of any significant size in Clarborough and Hayton are how the village school would be able to cope with any more children, at present the school is to capacity with the corridor even having to be used as a classroom.
74	2	Site 179/258: My other main concern is the major development proposed at Celery Meadows (170, 258) for a possible 93 houses, and the access roads and junctions to the site not being adequate for the number of vehicles that this size of development would generate.
74	3	Option A
74	4	If this application is included at this stage for a proposed 19 houses surely these will for fill the councils target of 12 houses within Clarborough and Hayton. Therefore no further consultation or expense is necessary.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
74	5	171 and 544
74	6	The road infrastructure in Clarborough is a major problem area and any development should incorporate these issues.
74	7	REMOVED
75	1	Yes
75	2	Option A
75	3	No. Blyth is a quiet rural village and any new development would impact on facilities, traffic and noise. It is already a very busy through road for traffic and more housing development would contribute to this plus contribute to the loss of the village life and environment. This is why we moved here two years ago. Additional concerns are the loss in the value of properties.
75	4	Site 214 - This is further away from any current houses which would have a lesser impact. In addition, the fields would provide a 'buffer' for noise. However, if other sites near to this one were also built on then there is a threat of over population on residents from Retford Road
75	5	Site 213 - This is easier access to the main roads therefore less impact on already busy B roads which are already seen as a risk to children and the local school. In addition, this is already a more populated area and nine houses would add little change to the environment.
75	6	Retford Road is already a concern regarding traffic safety and noise from the A1. Blyth is not a highly populated area which is why it is many people's choice to locate here. It has the attributes of a rural village which could be lost with further housing developments. The impact on extending the school site could also impact on surrounding properties.
75	7	Yes! They are part and parcel of the village and by losing these spaces it will create a town environment which is not what the residents of Blyth want. If we'd have wanted this we would have paid less to move to Worksop!!
75	8	They should be kept to existing sites which already cater for these communities. Again, the impact would be huge in new locations.
75	9	Not sure.
75	10	No.
76	1	Yes
76	2	Option A
76	3	Yes
76	4	No
76	5	Site 296 and Site 453. Site 345
76	6	No
76	7	Both sites require protection from any future development
76	8	Yes current sites have spare capacity and can be further developed to meet future requirements
76	9	Together
76	10	None
77	1	I have concerns that the screening process may not be fully transparent post-decision. I would like reassurance that all decisions are subject to transparency, including the scoring criteria and the consistency of application, to all decisions regarding potential development sites.
77	2	Option A
77	3	I am supportive of residential development for permanent residents. I would be keen to ensure that whatever quantum of additional housing is agreed that a strong proportion is capped at affordable for local families and first time buyers.
77	4	I live directly opposite the proposed site. I am not opposed to the proposed development even though this will no doubt lead to disruption and increased traffic for a period of time. I would like assurance though that the previous lack of action by the Council to ensure an alternative route for Heavy Goods vehicles down The Smeath and this additional construction traffic is not going to put pedestrians, particularly children, at additional risk.
77	5	Site 544 - this would provide greater continuity of residential housing across both sides of Main Street, Hayton
77	6	Not that I would wish to raise
77	7	478 & 541 should be protected this is an open field that provides residents with a view of Hayton Church. In my opinion this should be protected.
77	8	I believe that traveller sites should be developed from existing sites, and not developed from new locations. Existing locations already have an infrastructure that can be further enhanced to meet the needs of who use them. There is also the issue of public engagement and the transparency of Council Plans for such sites. Are traveller sites being considered for the Clarborough and Hayton area? If this is an option being considered by the Council then I believe that you be much more open and engage the Public in separate and distinct consultation. Piggybacking what most residents would consider to be a separate issue requiring focussed consultation onto a consultation about permanent residential housing development is potentially miss-judged at best.
77	9	Together. Infrastructure development provides the opportunity to meet the needs of both groups. Also travellers who migrate from one site to another may leave the site in a state that requires little additional investment (cleaning/removal of waste/etc) if peer pressure from other residential travellers is present.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
77	10	No.
78	1	No more developments of any kind in Carlton in Lindrick, as it is already quite large enough as a village. As there is a large development planned for the Costhorpe industrial estate, which has already been passed, there should be no more development needed for Carlton in Lindrick.
78	2	As Langold is a far smaller village, than the already highly developed Carlton in Lindrick, then surely the places to consider for future development are plots 219 and 385 in Langold.
78	3	Plots 176,520 and 197 surrounding the existing estate, These are close to a pumping station, which takes away the sewage and waste water. This, on at least two occasions has failed, leaving the estate in a bit of a smelly mess. Sewage has returned to family toilets and bathrooms. If the existing pumping station can not take the present estate's waste then how will it cope with the added waste of the new estate?
78	4	The present estate has not been adopted as yet; nether for roads, lighting or anything else, so if new area of houses, is added then who will deal with the future problems.
78	5	Traffic will increase due to the Firbeck development, so if even more houses and industry, are to be developed, then the village hall experience big traffic problems especially along Doncaster Road. We agree 14 appendix c: page 135 all listed below what issues can be considered.
78	6	REMOVED
79	1	I would like to see more possible consideration of impact and loss issues.
79	2	Many Retford people will wonder why we need any more houses at all. Without more employment growth, more houses are not needed. Is any consideration made of current housing, potential developments and unsold new and previously used housing.
79	3	I am surprised to see site 58 in orange. I think this is clearly a protected open space. On the 70's estate along west north road this was one of 2 open amenity spaces for local people. The site in question is a significant play area for children, well used, particularly in summer. It is also a popular walking area for many dog owners all year. I strongly urge you to redesignate this site. Some of the original trees have been lost over the years and it would be good to plant some more.
79	4	The east side of North Road 51/R7 should be used for employment development first.
79	5	Although 51/R7 is exceptional agriculture land supporting crops and livestock throughout the year, if more employment opportunities can be found, starting at the north west extremity would be preferable.
79	6	Also land to the east side of north road beyond the nature reserve with the new road access could surely be used.
79	7	Site 27 is an employment site now, or has been - this should be retained.
79	8	Sites 511,370,489,488 and 3 have severe drainage problems.
79	9	Site 70 has a very important footpath in poor condition which is a vital link to the railway station.
79	10	Retain all protection on all open spaces.
79	11	Please help to redevelop existing employment sites which are not currently being used and are not very attractive to developers.
79	12	Existing sites adequate. If definitely not extend to minimum requirement.
80	1	I would like to register my objection to the possible development of the land area marked 69 on the Core Strategy document as proposed by Bassetlaw District Council. This plot is the area between (1) raised railway line (2) Leverton Road (3) Chesterfield Canal (4) Welham Road. This land is very low lying and after any rain visually waterlogged, it provides a natural habitat for the many animals and birds of which there is an abundance i.e. protected barn owls, herons, coots, moorhens, kingfishers, sparrow hawks, curlews, kestrels and the many other smaller bird. In addition, there are the protected water voles field mice, bats and all number of small mammals.
80	2	The close presence of the raised section of railway would create a noise issue in itself.
80	3	The only access is via Welham Road, which is a very busy road and would create danger to all traffic.
80	4	This area attracts many people who walk along the towpath just to admire the view and the wildlife regardless of the weather it is one of the very few areas which is in its natural state without any human presence, and is a jewel and should be kept as such.
81	1	Durham Grove as I'm sure you are aware is a narrow access with a short right angled bend. Developing this site would result in heavy lorry activity to the building site at the end of the grove. Bearing in mind that the local refuse lorry has to reverse into the grove to undertake collection, lorries delivering to the proposed building site may encounter the same difficulties. If there are cars parked on the roadway this may restrict safe access also. This in turn is fundamentally a retirement dwelling area then amount stress may cause ill health for some residents'.
81	2	For some years now when there is heavy rain this result in flooding at the junction of Palmer Road/Durham Grove. This is due to the fact that the surface runoff and drainage at the above junction appear to be blocked. The resulting flood waters only drain channel is Durham Grove to a convenient road drain, and then I believe to somewhere at the point of the proposed new building plot.
81	3	Furthermore, if the building of houses on plot 533 were to go ahead, is there a possibility that the sewage drains of this development would be connected to the present system installed in Durham Grove. Further work needs to be undertaken to reduce the threat of flooding and blockages within this area.
81	4	I am not suggesting that housing development should be in any others people's back yards but mine; therefore I am only giving my opinions on development in the areas of my own locality.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
81	5	Therefore the areas I am considering are as follows, 512, 37, 533, 7, 6, 460 and 309. Depending upon access routes from these developments, lie close to present roads adjacent to the above sites, then I believe great congestion could arise on Welham Road with Tiln Lane and Longholme Road junctions. I would also point out there is a school on Tiln Lane and cars are parked at times for drop off and collection of school children, also Tiln Lane is a route for high sided HGV's who cannot use Welham Road due to a low bridge
81	6	The committed housing sites shown on the map provided nearly encircle Retford town and as you are no doubt aware there are times of lengthy traffic jams on each of the access routes into the town. Building dwellings and developments would encourage greater traffic volume and greater restrictions at road junctions
81	7	I feel that the building of housing and industrial units should be encouraged but however, the impact on the centre of the town should be considered.
82	1	REMOVED
82	2	No
82	3	Towards North Road
82	4	Any
82	5	Cannot Comment
82	6	No
82	7	Yes
82	8	No
82	9	Option A
82	10	Rural Site
82	11	Together
82	12	REMOVED
83	1	The Site 41 in Ordsall behind Glen Eagles Way. The residents bought their bungalows because of the views it is a terrible thought to build most people are older and have bought their homes to see out their days. Plus, no one would buy our bungalows. There is lots of land going out the 2 miles towards Elkesley and also to the right of the A1 towards Ranby, please have respect for older people.
83	2	REMOVED
83	3	REMOVED
83	4	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these development
83	5	is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that
83	6	In addition there will be a significant loss of amenity'
83	7	which the local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
83	8	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing
83	9	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
84	1	The land is on Limestone and provides an absolute stable and sound base for foundations and footings.
84	2	There is no flooding or water logging on any part of the site.
84	3	The mine workings at Shireoaks Colliery have long since stopped and any evidence of subsidence was about 35 years ago.
84	4	Due to its elevated position, the natural fall of the site makes towards the existing sewer main near highgrounds industrial estate.
84	5	There are two defined points of entry to the area, which would call for no demolition of property or resetting of existing boundaries. A third point of entry may be through the farmstead.
84	6	The site is in a good location and offers excellent facilities for residents
84	7	A larger village would benefit local trades such as the shop, post office, chinese takeaway and two public houses.
84	8	Any additional housing would be a shopping destination for the Sainsbury super store and would perform the important role of ensuring the future needs of residents
84	9	The area to the south has been given over to natural woodland regeneration to provide a wildlife corridor between Lady Lee Nature Reserve (SSSI) and woodlands to the rear of Highgrounds Industrial Estate. A concessionary right to enter has been agreed. This agreement is set for a period of 15 years.
84	10	Haggonfields Primary School and nursery would benefit from the extra intake of children that more housing would generate.
84	11	Public transport services run into Rhodesia every half hour therefore a re-route could be done without any problem.
84	12	The good shape of the area lends itself to a layout of housing to suit varying needs.
84	13	The area is naturally bounded by the village itself and the lane to Mansfield Road.
84	14	The area of land has no power supplies above or below ground. It has no footpaths or rights of way on it except for the footpath to Highgrounds Industrial Estate. The Council and Severn Trent Water have a right to inspect and maintain the existing sewer.
84	15	The total area is freehold with no covenants and is registered
85	1	Yes

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
85	2	A
85	3	No more than 20
85	4	part of 239 close to the pub and 236 and part of 237 that front Top Pasture Lane
85	5	Yes
85	6	Around Existing sites to provide facilities but contain development
85	7	REMOVED
86	1	Site Ref: 224 and 234. A638 is a fast road (should be 30mph) A short time ago there were also serious holes in the road at the junction with Arundel Drive due to subsidence. Properties on North Road are all subject to subsidence. Buildings on sites 224 and 234 may cause more problems.
86	2	Site 157 and 516
86	3	14 no more
86	4	516,156,157
86	5	Apart from building on 224 drains and pavements would have to be laid and dykes filled.
86	6	Regarding site 224 there is a considerable slope on this land may cause problems with landslides.
86	7	REMOVED
86	8	REMOVED
86	9	Daneshill as stated.
87	1	Not informed as to wait the criteria were our foremost concern is to ensure no Building work goes ahead.
87	2	A, but a non rural location
87	3	No
87	4	No
87	5	None
87	6	Sewage pumping station , drains etc, would not be able to cope. Also, certain areas indicated, have public rights of way straight through them and electricity pylons. Also, lots of residents in Hayton did not receive the information or map regarding these proposed sites. This includes ourselves who found out by accident. A true reflection for the whole of Hayton is a resounding NO WAY!
87	7	yes
87	8	In and around existing sites
87	9	Together
87	10	No
88	1	Option A
88	2	I'd be happy for 13 new houses in Everton, but the nine dwellings started at Corner Farm and 2 dwellings which have permission on Everton Sluice Lane and 2/3 dwellings between High Street and Chapel Lane on Old Cottage site would be the 13 I would expect and 5 affordable housing.
88	3	I would not expect any of the sites shown on the map to have houses as the 13 houses have already had sites agreed.
88	4	The open spaces identified are the school and Metcalf Land so I would expect them to be protected.
89	1	Yes
89	2	Option A
89	3	Yes, I think Rampton could see new housing over the next few years.
89	4	Sites 228 and 483 are the best sites as they are closest to the existing village.
89	5	The school is a long way out of the village with no direct footpath from Rampton and therefore extra children will have problems getting to school.
89	6	I agree that the open spaces should be protected.
89	7	Existing sites, although new sites if needed.
90	1	Yes.
90	2	Option A.
90	3	Yes - I agree that the village should see future housing growth, particularly affordable units.
90	4	410 as this is now redundant and falling into disrepair. No new housing along the main Retford road as this would cause traffic congestion.
90	5	School is full to capacity.
90	6	Yes, but careful consideration of the old school house and the tree should be taking into account. The development of this site makes sense as it is formerly developed
90	7	I think existing sites in Worksop.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
91	1	Option A.
91	2	No, I do not agree that any more land should be allocated for any further housing development in Ranskill. My main general reasons and opinions are as follows:- 1. The village is large enough as it presently stands.
91	3	2. Development of any size and Ranskill would be in danger of becoming a "small town".
91	4	3. The infrastructure of the village is adequate as it presently stands. Further development would therefore put greater burden on the infrastructure.
91	5	4. More traffic would be generated. This would impact on access and egress through the village together with safety issues.
91	6	5. The loss of agricultural land together with its ecological environment which once developed and built on is lost forever. This is a rural farming village not a town.
91	7	6. Further development would not therefore enhance the aesthetics of the village.
91	8	7. Finally, on a personal note any development on proposed site number 234 and the residents of Arundel Drive, myself included, would lose their privacy and be overlooked
91	9	None
91	10	No. I believe I have covered my main points in Question 105
91	11	I confirm that I believe the open spaces identified on the map provided should be protected.
91	12	Yes
91	13	If the system the Council currently operates works I believe it should remain.
91	14	None
92	1	We feel that there is very little need for additional housing development in Retford as there are already several building developments underway, a constant stream of older and new properties for sale, and limited employment opportunities within the town and surrounding areas since the larger works have closed down. At present the highway system in and around town struggles to accommodate the volume of traffic.
92	2	The areas with good road access should be developed first, if required for housing - i.e. site nos. 1, 3, 27, 37, 41, 52, 512.
92	3	51 and R7 would be best for employment
92	4	It is worth noting that the eastern side of Retford is on clay, therefore more susceptible to flooding, whereas the western side is on sand which is more free-draining and would require less drainage infrastructure for buildings.
92	5	As many green spaces as possible should be preserved.
92	6	I would like to see any additional growth situated as near as possible to employment opportunities, wherever they may be.
92	7	Also sites nos. 6 and 69, possibly, though not ones through estates.
93	1	As a member of the third generation of a Beckingham family, I have seen Beckingham develop from a RURAL village to a DORMITORY village. Further development, whether 7 or 20 will not return to a rural village again, so as a dormitory village with affordable housing it would assist and sustain the village school, playschool and other village activities etc.
93	2	Site 451- This particular site already benefits from nearby services, access, mains and sewerage.
93	3	Site references 496 - There is historical interest in this area, an ancient fish pond/moat is recorded on a village map in 1736.
93	4	Site references 497 - There is historical interest in this area, an ancient fish pond/moat is recorded on a village map in 1736.
93	5	Site 106- The proposed site for a Public House was originally planned on land nearer the village hall/roundabout, which was certainly a more acceptable area.
93	6	Site 107- Development on this site certainly would not enhance the entrance to our village. It would create a view of over-development.
93	7	Site 106 - Certainly no to this question. A potential development of any kind shouldn't be considered for reasons stated previously. Development would cause further traffic hazards.
93	8	The village green (near the Post Office) hasn't been identified as a potential protected open space - this, I feel, is an area that needs it. The other identified areas should be protected.
93	9	Extent existing sites.
93	10	Also, the aviation fuel pipeline from Misterton into Lincolnshire passes through this proposed area of development. It has always been my understanding that development on or near this pipeline would never be permitted.
94	1	REMOVED
94	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
94	3	I believe that your statistics were taken as a mean when there was no box to tick for 0 (zero) build. The overwhelming response of the village is for no new development as outlined in the parish plan document. There are already 7 new dwellings with recently acquired or pending planning permission - well above the 4 dwellings allocated through this consultation
94	4	Site 281, 536
94	5	The utilities in this village are already under capacity, with more and more issues with drainage, road/pathway improvements. Any development would need to see significant buy in to the modernisation of the utilities. Affordable housing was accepted as a whole for small cottage style in keeping with the village for buyers wanting to get to village life - not social housing, how could it possibly benefit low income people with insufficient public transport and lack of amenities
94	6	Yes they should be protected.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
94	7	There is a piece of land within plot 299 which has dubious ownership as it used to be community land/bowling green, and in effect is in the middle of land claim issue - how could this be developed?
94	8	No, Daneshill is not being fully utilised so why provide more? Perhaps there is a requirement in other areas of the district
94	9	Together, more financially viable
95	1	Yes.
95	2	Option A.
95	3	I agree, but I would support further growth if it meant the village could see some low cost housing for young people.
95	4	410 and 577 no sites on the main road due to the traffic problems.
95	5	The village has a lack of services and now no village hall.
95	6	All open spaces should be protected.
95	7	Yes, but sympathetically not just a large modern housing estate.
96	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
96	2	No i feel villages are being overtaken once it as started by development which causes more crime and traffic
96	3	None
96	4	There is plenty of land already been built on going to ruin which could be used
96	5	Land in the villages standing idle could be used for the village i.e. sports /football pitch or play area for children
96	6	There is already a site at Daneshill which is standing idle which could be developed and council controlled
96	7	Together on existing sites and council controlled
96	8	Daneshill
97	1	Not well enough informed to comment.
97	2	Option A.
97	3	I thought the feedback was for 10 houses. Other than infill the houses should be restricted to one area , see below
97	4	I have no access to the site ref number as I cannot find the map on the web site. However I consider the site to the West of North rd to be an absolute no . Good productive agricultural land will be desperately needed in future. All the other sites have disadvantages and should not be considered for this limited scale development. The obvious site in Ranskill is the waste ground lying to the west of the North Rd between Bluebell court and the police house. The owners should be located via the land registry and approached. There is reason to believe they may be willing sellers. I am surprised this has not been done!
97	5	The village park & school playing field should be protected OTHER THAN the existing proposal for a Community Centre.
97	6	Existing sites
97	7	REMOVED
98	1	Yes
98	2	I believe the town should be allocated more housing growth as it will generate more interest in the growing area. With the need for additional housing becoming more prevalent than ever before, it is important to provide a substantial level of allocations for which developers can bring new and exciting schemes to the area. Such schemes offer existing residents and also new residents an opportunity to move to the town though a range of affordable and no. of bedroom properties.
98	3	The shireoaks site next to the canal (site reference 561) would strongly suit housing development. The current industrial buildings are deteriorating and given the canalside position, a housing scheme would be very attractive and offer great scenery and views down the canal. A housing scheme would prove hugely popular for residents and enhance the canalside Shireoaks area.
98	4	Option A
99	1	I don't know enough about the criteria to comment.
99	2	Option A
99	3	No new dwellings. The sewerage/drainage in the village is inadequate. I live in Church Lane and have had to clear the drains three times since June due to my next door neighbour's extension which provides an extra bathroom and toilet to the property.
99	4	Application has already been granted for Corner Farm. Presumably when this goes ahead there will be no need for an additional 12 houses. Where will the access/exit road be for the development. Presumably when the new houses are occupied you will be building an extension to Clarbrough School as it is already full to capacity!!
99	5	None
99	6	The sewerage/drainage in the village is inadequate.
99	7	Yes the sites should be protected.
99	8	REMOVED

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
100	1	Yes
100	2	Option A
100	3	Yes, I believe that the village should see some new housing for younger and older people.
100	4	Sites 228 and 483.
100	5	All open spaces should be kept.
100	6	Existing sites
101	1	I don't feel the screening takes into account the services, such as schools, shops and open spaces in the area. It doesn't appear to look in sufficient detail at the impact the developments could have on unsuitable roads in the vicinity.
101	2	I believe that brownfield sites should be used first before greenfield land is built on. There have been/are currently being built large numbers of new housing - which developers are currently having much difficulty selling e.g. the houses on the bridon site. The houses built recently along Albert Road also show what can happen as many were not bought and have had to be rented either privately or to problem families.
101	3	46, 309, 7, 3, 511, 370, 27 would seem to be most suitable considering existing local services and access routes.
101	4	I feel very strongly that the proposals to build such a huge number of houses in South Ordsall would have a hugely detrimental affect on the area. The existing roads are unsuitable for any more traffic (they are not gritted at all in winter) and the narrow road leading down to the A1 is dangerous already.
101	5	Yes - too many are already being lost
101	6	There is a need for playing fields and a play ground for young children in Ordsall - similar to that found in Hallcroft (see q13 above)
101	7	Option A
101	8	Existing sites
101	9	There will be a huge need for shops, more buses and a playground (Ordsall currently has 1 very small and vandalised play area off Grange Road. The current facilities are already overstretched and in need of investment.
101	10	Need a new school
102	1	I would like to object to the plans for future development for the building of houses in Clarborough at plots 258 and 170, my objections are as follows: 1 Land is liable to flooding during heavy rain.
102	2	Against sites 170/258 because: 2 Drainage on Broad Gores is already very poor.
102	3	Against sites 170/258 because: 3 Land is been used by farm to grow vital crops.
102	4	Against sites 170/258 because: 4 The tree on the land has a barn owl nest which is a protected species also lots of other wildlife are in the field.
102	5	Against sites 170/258 because: 5 No amenities in village.
102	6	Against sites 170/258 because: 6 Traffic already very busy in village and during the bad weather earlier this year roads in village were impassable for days and a number of accidents occurred on Big Lane.
102	7	Against sites 170/258 because: 7 No jobs in village.
102	8	Against sites 170/258 because: 8 Very poor public transport.
102	9	Against sites 170/258 because: 9 School bus to Retford in morning is standing room only.
102	10	Against sites 170/258 because: 10 No medical facility
102	11	Against sites 170/258 because: 11 Very poor Broadband coverage
102	12	Against sites 170/258 because: 12 Traffic on A620 very busy with lorries travelling to Power Station also High vehicles on Smeath Lane already a big problem exiting estate safely.
102	13	Against sites 170/258 because: 13 Not enough capacity within local Schools.
102	14	Against sites 170/258 because: 14 Connecting two parts of Broad Gores will create a rat run for traffic on already narrow roads.
102	15	Against sites 170/258 because: 15 Construction work will have a detrimental affect on the senior citizens bungalows directly adjacent.
103	1	We disagree. The 68 houses currently being built are more than sufficient (already increasing village housing by nearly 20%) in terms of infrastructure, traffic and the general rural character of Gringley on the Hill
103	2	No additional sites should be developed.
103	3	Site 134- greenfield area should be protected and should never be developed. Overshadowing, overlooking and loss of privacy. Existing buildings could be renovated but only if existing footprint plus style, height and outlook of current buildings is maintained. Ingle Nook cottage completely faces this site and the existing buildings from the main garden boundary. Any development would only be only a few metres from the front of the cottage and most of its windows. To fully appreciate this you would need to view the site within the cottage or garden.
103	4	We agree that the open places identified on the map and all other green spaces in the village should be protected from any future development proposals.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
104	1	Obviously there is around 38 spare capacity at the moment, although it is not clear whether that spare capacity is for Residential pitches or transit pitches as the two sets of statistics seem not to correlate.
104	2	Quite palpably there should be provision. The question is always, where ? Surely it should have as many possible sites suggested as for other types of 'provision'. Some of those sites within 'Bassetlaw Sites allocations Issues' for example?
105	1	Having studied the proposed development sites in the Worksop area and visited them personally i feel very strongly that the greatest consideration should be given to the re development of so called brown sites and Non Productive land as opposed to developing land which is currently being used for crops or pleasure purposes as i feel this kind of land will be at a premium in years to come .I do hope you will take the environment into consideration over and above the commercial and profit margins of the property developers.
106	1	Yes
106	2	Option A
106	3	Yes
106	4	203 & 105 are most appropriate as infill locations
106	5	I think it should be protected.
106	6	Traffic issues at both entrances to the village.
106	7	All should be protected.
107	1	Overall the methodology is acceptable. However, I think there was a missed opportunity in consulting with the landowners at an early stage and taking on board their comments. I also thought that the timing of the consultation meeting could have been better. As a commuter village the East Markham timing meant a lot of people could not attend resulting in a skewed survey.
107	2	Option A
107	3	I think that 11 new houses for the village over and above the factory development site is too few. In order for better facilities within the village there needs to be a substantial growth in its size to support it. Moreover, 11 new houses over a 15 year period suggests that there will be more infilling which does nothing for the attractiveness of the village. Far better to develop in designated zones which has little impact on the existing housing stock. The village should look to double its size over the next 15 years with the addition of 500 new houses.
107	4	Its clear that for any development to take place the transport connections and facilities need to be upgraded.
107	5	Site 508 is already surrounded by housing and a road network so can be converted. The land is not suitable for high grade agriculture so an alternative use needs to be found. At the present it is being used as a dumping ground by the local residents. A more productive use needs to be found.
107	6	Sites 522,523,& 524. These offer the opportunity for development within the village boundary but away from the centre of the village. Given the size that also offer up the possibility of a sports, recreation or play area that could be utilised by the remainder of the village.
107	7	Sites 109,110, & 526. These sites offer a similar solution to the above in that they are away from the centre of the village so would not impact on existing residents as alternative sites. The use of these sites would also enable Mark Lane to be developed so that it is no longer a narrow dangerous road to the benefit of all.
107	8	Given its proximity to the school this could be used by them for either additional car parking or class rooms.
107	9	Applying only 10% of the housing target to rural service centres is too low.
107	10	Given the proposed increase in the village size then the school would need to be upgraded.
107	11	There needs to be a move away from the restrictions placed on the design of the houses in the village. The conservation area restrictions has resulted in bankrupt architecture (Stocks Fold) which does little to enhance the village. Any future development should make use of eco technologies and move away form replicating 19th century housing stock.
107	12	With regard to the sports and recreation facilities the village suffers from having a Village Hall with no landlord and a sports field with no facilities. The village badly needs an integrated site which offers not just a hall but also incorporating proper sporting facilities eg playing fields , changing rooms and a bar.
107	13	Site 508. Old Hall Lane should not be retained as an open space. It is private land albeit the local residents seem happy to use it on the backdrop for sales particulars or as area to exercise their dogs. If it is to be classified as an open space then it needs to be purchased as such. The current arrangement neither satisfies the land owner or the residents.
107	14	Areas currently used for recreational facilities should remain so for the time being. However, as noted previously there needs to be a proper integrated facility for the 21st century.
107	15	REMOVED
107	16	REMOVED
108	1	See question 46
108	2	This permission has been granted for 20 dwellings. That is more than enough building for our area. Additional buildings have been erected in the village in the last 5 years and I feel that more building would detract from this lovely village.
108	3	We already have a substantial flow of traffic through the village and don't want anymore.
108	4	Corner Farm is at an already difficult to negotiate junction. It will be interesting to see how this develops.
108	5	Hayton has problems with flooding in the middle and towards the end of the village (towards Clayworth). This occurs every year and if more properties are built it will surely make this situation worse. Traffic access and noise pollution

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
108	6	None, bearing in mind 20 have been granted.
108	7	This was agreed based on the assumption by almost all residents I have spoken to that Corner Farm would be the preferred development. Planning was approved prior to the meeting on 24 November. We have been misled. I do not believe we should have any further building as we want to preserve our village.
108	8	The village cannot really stand more development as there is already as strain on the drainage and roads. There are no village amenities.
108	9	Yes
108	10	I think it would be sensible to concentrate and improve existing sites.
108	11	REMOVED
108	12	I do not know of any.
109	1	Planning is granted. No further development should be allowed.
109	2	None otherwise we will lose our village atmosphere. We will have problems with traffic which will add to the problems we already have each year with flooding near my property.
110	1	Disagree. Road and lanes are already busy with traffic. More buildings will bring more problems.
110	2	Portland Place - roads very narrow, cars, lorries, vans etc. To open up the cul-de-sac could be an accident waiting to happen.
110	3	REMOVED
110	4	No playing facilities for children, other than on roads etc.
110	5	Nowhere for youths to go but hang about the streets.
110	6	Bungalow on Portland Place empty for years. Seven new properties already built in the village.
110	7	Sewerage system. The one already in use wouldn't cope.
110	8	A million empty houses in the country should be dealt with first.
110	9	Street lighting - what it must have cost the tax payers for all lamps in and around the village to have stickers on every lamp, letting burglars aware, we have gone back to the old days. NCC must have paid someone to display these adverts! Come on: waste not, want not.
111	1	I agree with the figure of 12 new houses. If planning permission has already been granted for 15 new houses in Hayton, why was planning permission granted for a further 19 houses on Corner Farm? This now gives a total of 31 houses.
111	2	19 new houses on the Corner Farm site seems to be far too many for the size of the site in view of the following: 1) It does not fit in with the general aspect of open planning and space given to other properties in Hayton - incompatibility with neighbouring properties.
111	3	This corner is already very dangerous. Another serious accident on Sunday 4 December is further proof of this. Vehicles from another 19 houses would make this situation even worse.
111	4	Infill sites for small developments should be used - i.e. 1 to 4 properties.
111	5	Density of new properties should be a serious consideration to ensure they fit in with the open aspect of the village of Hayton. Bungalows rather than houses etc.
111	6	Fit into existing estates where space is available - i.e. in Clarborough, around Celery Meadows (site 170 and part of 258).
111	7	High voltage power lines and pylons cut across the village of Hayton. These particularly affect sites 541 and 478. Previous studies recommend that new housing should not be built on such sites due to the high risk of cancer, particularly in newborn babies. Reference Sheffield.
111	8	14 dwellings on site 541 would be far too many and would not blend in with neighbouring properties that are mainly bungalows.
111	9	Dwellings on site 541 would overshadow and overlook the three bungalows on Rectory Grounds, causing lack/loss of privacy. They would also cut out light, particularly in winter when the sun is low.
111	10	Yes.
111	11	Concentrate on existing sites.
111	12	Yes
112	1	What is Screening Methodology? I've no idea.
112	2	No. There are too many houses being built for the sewage to service. Bassetlaw Council ignore what locals say, saying it is a Severn Trent problem, who do nothing.
112	3	Also, walk around the village and see how many houses are up for sale. So don't build more until there is demand.
112	4	Option A
112	5	None
112	6	The only suitable site for a Public House is next to the village hall. Unfortunately Bassetlaw Planners thought differently to Beckingham villagers.
112	7	Site 496 overlooks our cemetery so no building should be allowed so that it remains a quiet and sacred place.
112	8	As a land owner why was I not invited to put land forward? I have land running up to development.
113	1	I disagree. No house should be allocated - in accordance with the Parish Plan.
113	2	I note that the four houses you claim was suggested in previous feedback is totally misleading and mathematically wrong.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
113	3	Sutton cum Lound is a small rural village and this should be maintained - it is large enough as it stands.
114	1	Why build more Gypsy sites when Daneshill Travellers Site has got 16 plots?
114	2	Why don't the Council spend money on Daneshill Travellers Site, Lound, Retford?
114	3	Why look for other Gypsy sites to build when we have Daneshill which needs money spending on it?
114	4	Daneshill Travellers site is used for transit pitches and residential.
114	5	Daneshill Travellers Site needs no planning as it is already built. Just need the Council to spend money on the site.
114	6	REMOVED
115	1	I am writing to you to state my objection to the proposed development for housing on the area known as No 69 on the Core Strategy document, proposed by BDC. My main objections are: 1) The plot of land is a natural floodplain for the chesterfield canal and surface water runoff.
115	2	2) The plot is also home to a vast array of wildlife including a family of protected barn owls, kestrels, heron and various other wild fowl, which has obviously found a constant food supply there in the form of field mice, insects and such like.
115	3	The train line that intersect plot 69 would also be a major disadvantage to any prospective buyers to any property built within such close proximity.
115	4	Any site access would create a traffic grid lock entering or exiting via the Hop Pole layby. This road is already under a lot of pressure being a major through road between Gainsborough and Retford, especially during peak traffic hours.
115	5	I bought my property partly because of the stunning views of Leverton Woods and the peace and tranquillity of the canal passing right by the end of my garden.
115	6	I feel any building or development work on plot 69 would devalue my property significantly
115	7	Have a huge ecological impact on the area and the countless families who enjoy and admire what i believe to be an outstanding area of beauty.
116	1	I have lived on Brixworth Way for 18 years and bought this house partly because of its position and that the land to the rear of my property I believed to be green belt land that could not be built on.
116	2	As I have seen over the years some serious flooding of this land I cannot understand why someone wants to build on this land, as surely drainage would be very difficult.
116	3	Who would want to live at the side of a raised railway line that cannot be screened to reduce the noise or the land raised above the railway line?
116	4	Access to this additional housing would mean an increase in traffic leaving and joining Welham Road at a poor visibility spot, so the speed limit would have to be reduced. The layby at the Hop Pole is currently used for lorries too high to get under the low bridge to turn around.
116	5	There is considerable rare wildlife in this area that would also be affected by the proposed building on this land.
116	6	I consider that if this planning was agreed it would overlook us and reduce the value of my property. I will be seeking compensation if this goes ahead.
117	1	Increased traffic (safety concerns)
117	2	Increase in noise
117	3	Busy access routes
117	4	Pressures on the local school due to increased numbers of people living in the area
117	5	The detrimental effect on living conditions and the environment
117	6	A substantial decrease in the amount of green land within the area.
118	1	My main concern is that any additional housing will generate more traffic on an already very busy road. Road safety must be a serious consideration because on the narrow road (Town St) cars have to be parked on the pavement causing pedestrians to walk in the road. This is a safety problem.
119	1	The Society considers that in selecting sites for development the aim should be to achieve a compact urban form where most people will have easy access to town centre facilities. New housing should be spread around the town rather than being all in one place. It should be where it will cause least traffic problems, where local facilities (schools, shops, etc.) have spare capacity and where there will be no drainage or access problems. It should avoid the most attractive or productive land.
119	2	Sites 364, 41, 1, 52 and 40 - This would be a suitable general location for some of the required houses although the suggested sites here far exceed what is needed.
119	3	Site 259 - is an unsuitable location for employment generating development as Ordsall is a primarily a housing area and commercial traffic should not be encouraged here.
119	4	Site 71- This small site is next to the railway and very noisy. It is not a suitable place for housing but would be suitable for employment generating development.
119	5	Site 70 -Access to this elevated site is through the station approach. It would provide a poor residential environment due to train noise, and houses would detract from the openness of the riverside corridor. The site should be reserved in case more land is needed for station related parking.
119	6	Site 10 - This is the last of the Thrumpton Lane industrial sites. Most of the longstanding employment sites in Retford have been lost to housing and the remaining land suitable for employment should be retained to avoid Retford becoming even more a dormitory town. This site should not be developed for housing but should be kept for employment creating development.
119	7	Sites 27, 3, 370, 511, 488 and 489 - This may be a suitable general location for some of the required houses although the suggested sites far exceed what is needed. However, there is a history of flooding in the area and no further development should be allowed unless the flooding problem is solved. Further development should only be allowed if, in addition, it can be shown that it will not cause or aggravate traffic problems at the junctions with London Road.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
119	8	Site 342 - This site had planning permission in the past and an application is current. It would be a suitable site for housing.
119	9	Sites 6 and 69 - Site 6 is a logical extension up to the canal of the built up area and suitable for housing. The canal is the logical boundary here and Site 69 would be the first development beyond it.
119	10	Sites 7, 46, 309 and 533 - This may be a suitable general location for some of the required houses although the suggested sites far exceed what is needed.
119	11	Sites 37 and 512 - Site 37 is a suitable general location for some of the required houses although it exceeds what is needed. Site 512 and the land to the west of it forming part of site 37 would extend the built up area excessively and should not be developed.
119	12	Site 51/R7 - The west side of North Road is a suitable location for some of the required houses although the suggested site far exceeds what is needed. This is the most suitable place for further employment creating development as it has good road access. The land north of Randall Way is readily developable for employment, and land to the west of North Road, beyond any housing allocation, would also be suitable for employment. To soften the appearance of new buildings at this entrance to the town, the land owner should be encouraged to establish tree planting belts along North Road well in advance of any development.
119	13	Site 1/70 - Part of the land proposed as protected open space at Jubilee Road is allotments. The remainder is neglected and semi-wild. Although it has some recreational value, it is not worthy of protection as an open space. The allotments should remain as protected open space, but the rest of the site should be allocated for housing with a policy restricting the scale of building and requiring provision of a properly landscaped and equipped small park as part of the development. This is a good, accessible housing site. Its development would reduce the need to build on peripheral farm land. As indicated above, only the allotments here should be protected as there is scope for some development on the rest of the site. Even if it is decided not to promote building here during the lifetime of the new Plan, the site should not be protected as open space as this would needlessly restrict the ability to allow development at some time in the future
119	14	Bellmoor Quarry - Land at the entrance to the processing plant site should be allocated for employment creating development. Some of it is so allocated in the Bassetlaw Local Plan and the allocation should be extended up to the nature reserve to the south. When the quarry eventually ceases operation, the processing plant site could accommodate a further employment estate.
119	15	Sites 24 and 44 - Land here is close to the town centre, neglected and unsightly. It could make a good housing site but access is poor and there is a flooding problem. It is hard to see how the identified sites, on their own, could be developed. However if they were combined with adjoining land to the north, there may be potential for residential development on a scale sufficient to fund a solution to the drainage problem and produce an alternative access from Leverton Road. This possibility could be reflected in an 'opportunity site' larger than suggested in the consultation document.
119	16	Additional sites to be considered. The Society considers that the following sites all warrant designation as protected open space. They are significant area which contribute to the appearance of the town and the enjoyment of local people. 1. The Retford cemetery 2. Land occupied by the Retford Tennis Club 3. The Hallcroft Fisheries site, and land between it and site 1/79.
119	17	Designation of the Hallcroft Fisheries site should not, however, be applied so as to restrict the operation of fishing and caravanning activities there.
119	18	This site is also low and has flooding problems. It is not, generally, suitable for housing.
119	19	However, the core strategy refers to scope for a marina in Retford and this is the obvious place for one. If the drainage problems can be overcome, Site 69 would be a suitable site for a mixed development in which the provision of a marina is accompanied by some housing.
119	20	Sites 46 and 309 are believed to be affected by restrictive covenants which may effectively prevent development.
120	1	Option A
120	2	Disagree - There has been an extensive build already agreed in the village on the former detention centre site. This in itself will change the dynamics of the village already and is way over the 10% figure. There is no need for any additional houses and the proposed additional 8 houses on this site would completely change the character of Finkell Street.
120	3	No other sites - the former detention centre build fulfils the village requirement for new builds
120	4	Finkell Street has no pavements and many children walk along the road - both for the park and returning home from school. In addition the lighting is poor with minimal street lighting. There would be real safety concerns with the additional traffic that would result from an additional 8 houses. The traffic would not be just from the owners cars - but from visitors / deliveries etc. In addition - additional heavy traffic would result during the construction - it would be very unsafe for any pedestrians - both young and old.
120	5	This plot should be protected from ANY future developments - it has a special character for the village and for the immediate area. There is no requirement for any additional houses / builds on this site. Apart from the safety issues the plot is part of a farm and this area is a rural farming community and should be kept for future generations to enjoy. What would be acceptable is the refurbishment of the existing buildings to maintain the character of the site.
120	6	REMOVED
120	7	Not at all in this village/ area : This should not be considered for Gringley on the Hill.
120	8	Would suggest Worksop - Not Gringley on the Hill - minimum of 20 miles from Gringley.
121	1	Yes
121	2	Option A

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
121	3	Disagree. The significant development on the former detention centre site will already expand the village population by more than 25 %. This must surely be an adequate expansion for at least a decade, especially where few local services are available and the road infrastructure within the village is poor and has very few pedestrian footpaths. Children in particular are already at risk from the increased traffic flow, especially on routes such as Finkell Street which has no footpath but is the main pedestrian access to the playing field.
121	4	I believe both represent significant risks to pedestrians and other motorists due to the narrowness of the roads onto which they will give access, and the lack of footpaths, along with dangerous blind bends in the road. As mentioned above, Finkell Street is the main route for children on foot and bicycles travelling to the village playing field. As a resident of this street I see children and parents with pushchairs going along to the park this road every single day, and they would be put at great risk by 10-20 additional vehicles accessing new housing on Finkell Street.
121	5	Lack of proper road planning within the village is an issue, and will become far more acute when the additional traffic caused by new homes on the detention centre site are all occupied. There are few footpaths and no cycle paths.
121	6	Yes, and I would add further open spaces which are currently used for livestock, as these fields within the village form a vital part of its character.
121	7	In and around existing sites because local service providers such as schools and health centres are already serving these sites.
121	8	Don't know
122	1	Yes
122	2	Option A
122	3	Yes I agree
122	4	238
122	5	All should be kept
123	1	I generally agree with the screening methodology.
123	2	However I do think there needs to be more inclusion of landowners in making suggestions for potential uses for their land and also more consultation. The consultation in East Markham for example was conducted in a fairly narrow time frame which meant that a number of people who commute for work were unable to attend the meetings.
123	3	The questionnaire process which seems now to have informed this process could also have been communicated better (through workshops or information sessions) to achieve a better understanding of it's purpose, better response rate and to encourage the community to be more proactively involved in village design.
123	4	In terms of Criterion 1 Is the local community supportive of the development of this site, I would advise that caution is exercised particularly in villages to ensure that objections are based on legitimate planning considerations rather than other factors.
123	5	I do not agree that only 10% of the housing target should be allocated to Rural Service Centres as indicated in question 35 above.
123	6	Over a fifteen year period I believe there should be substantial development in the village, perhaps doubling its size ie an additional 500 plus houses. I believe that the key thing is for there to be investment in other facilities such as the school to ensure there are additional places and also addition of other village services to support a growing population. For example the Village needs a small supermarket or shop, a medical centre and more permanent post office.
123	7	I believe there should be a wide range of housing including the full spectrum of first time buyer affordable housing to family homes and retirement friendly accommodation to create a balanced village profile.
123	8	I think that further housing investment could only benefit the village in giving access to wider funding for other facilities and services.
123	9	I do not have any particular objection to development on any of the sites identified providing transport systems and facilities are improved to support any development (which can be a condition of planning).
123	10	Sites 522, 523 and 524 if all sites are developed together they would allow for a development within the village boundary but without overdevelopment of the centre of the village. With sites 522 and 523 being developed together it would be possible to allow for road widening to ensure safe access. Given the size of the sites involved the site could also include a sports, recreation or play area which could be used by all members of the village. The sites are essentially outside the conservation area or on it's boundary and as such would be ideal for development.
123	11	Site 508 - is already surrounded by housing and could easily be linked into existing services and into the existing road network. The land is not usable for high grade agriculture as it is too small, of poor quality and increasingly is being used as an area for local householders to illegally dump their garden waste. The field has never been used for any form of recreational activity formal or informal and there is no right of access for the public to use the area in any way. It is hard to see why this area should be saved as open space for villagers who have built houses on their own gardens (as such indicating they do not need open space).
123	12	Sites 109, 110 and 526 - again taken as a collection of sites these are usefully located at the edge of the village where the council have already developed affordable housing and granted permission for a new development of 41 houses. Development of these areas of land for a mixture of both housing and recreation uses is a good option. Use of these sites would allow for road widening or pavements to be built on Mark Lane which would improve road safety for the new development being considered. (At present Mark Lane is narrow, has no pavements or street lighting and as such on dark nights especially is potentially dangerous for pedestrians particularly if the volume of traffic increases with the new development on the former poultry site.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
123	13	Site 525 - would suggest that this area could be developed for the school. Rather than housing it could perhaps house additional classrooms or a small pre school or to create an outside learning environment. Alternatively it could be used to improve access and facilities to the nearby bowling club.
123	14	Having reviewed the questionnaire and the Village Design Statement I would comment as follows. I think that the village would benefit from a variation from the brick and pan tile style which appears to be enforced. New architectural styles could be respectful of the village without having to attempt to copy old styles. I am particularly interested in eco housing and earth sheltered housing similar to the Hockerton Housing Project where the buildings compliment the natural environment and include sustainable energy sources. The village would also benefit from the inclusion of renewable energy provision for new developments including wind turbines. A large amount of land has now been put forward within the village and additional areas not considered appropriate for housing may be useful sites to allow for renewable energy to be introduced.
123	15	I think that further investment in the local school is essential to ensure that there is sufficient school places for new families moving to the area. A larger pre school or nursery may also be useful.
123	16	In terms of sports and recreation facilities the village would benefit from more centrally located sports and recreation facilities or from having a Village Hall with on site facilities. Multi purpose play sports surface with lighting would be useful to allow for year round activities. I would suggest that one of the sites identified could provide an opportunity to establish a central recreation Hall with amenities and the existing Village Hall could be converted for another community use (eg Nursery/ crèche, Pre school). With careful design a new centre perhaps housing a cafe or community shop could also create new jobs and become self funded.
123	17	Overall my preference for future development would be for areas within the areas (as identified above) be developed in preference to further building of houses on gardens.
123	18	Areas regularly used by the Village Hall Committee for recreational purposes should be considered for open space protection.
123	19	I agree that the school land and playing field land should remain protected open space. (16/2, 16/6, 16/5, 16/4)
123	20	In addition to these areas there are fields which are used during village events such as May Day and Apple Day, unless this practice now ends I would suggest that these should become “protected open space”.
123	21	I do not consider that 508 (16/3), Old Hall Lane should be required to be retained as open space. The area is private land and has never been used for formal or informal recreation and has no rights of access for any member of the public. Since the end of bulky refuse collection there appears to have been an increase in people dumping garden waste on the site placing an unfair burden on the landowner. The dry stone walling of the field has also deteriorated as a result of stone being stolen from it over the years. I also consider that given recent granting of planning permissions for land on Farm Lane, High Street (neighbouring Old Hall Lane field and on the site opposite it) it would be unfair to insist on the Old Hall Lane field being retained as open space unless the Council should wish to acquire it for that purpose.
123	22	I think that there should be a dual approach to development for Gypsy and Traveller development with extension of existing sites for long term accommodation to allow traveller families to have the space to accommodate extended family groupings plus new sites identified for short term transit stop off sites. Transit sites could be relatively small and spread out to ensure that travellers are able to have access to public services during their stay without over whelming areas where there is inadequate service provision for any increase in population.
123	23	I think that consultation with the Traveller community directly is the best way to identify the most appropriate pitch provision. My personal view would be for there to be separate provision for transit and residential pitches which require different levels of facility provision. Residential pitches would need to be near to areas with capacity for long term school places and medical care for example.
123	24	Due to recent comments from some members of the East Markham community I sadly do not feel that Gypsies and Travellers would be able to live safely in this community.
124	1	I call for site 533 to be removed from BDC LDF for the following reasons: 1. There is no available access to the site.
124	2	2. There is a significant problem with flooding on Durham Grove which would be exacerbated by any development on this site. I refer to your correspondence with Nott's County Council over the past 5 years on this problem, which has not yet been solved. The dyke shown is no longer used for drainage.
124	3	3. Dunham Grove is extremely narrow and large vehicles have to reverse in to it because they are unable to turn around. Residents' parking also hinders traffic.
124	4	4. The existing foul water sewer is sinking and blockages have occurred because it cannot cope with existing input loading.
124	5	5. The size of the site is insignificant compared to others identified and will make no appreciable contribution to the housing market.
124	6	6. The site is too close to the racetrack for which permission was only recently given.
124	7	7. Granting permission for this site will open the way to further development on adjacent land.
124	8	8. The owner of the land has recently purchased a bungalow at the end of the grove - to give access to the site (?). This would destroy the aesthetic appeal of Dunham Grove.
124	9	I am lodging a protest against all three sites being included as they are prime agricultural land which, in the context of the world food shortage and the present economic crisis in the UK, should be retained for food production.
124	10	I also notice that the sites are outside the borough of Retford boundary and the development envelope previously agreed. This was to prevent encroachment in to the green belt and to protect against urban sprawl.
124	11	Any development on the sites earmarked would lead to significant traffic problems on Tiln Lane, especially at the junction with Moorgate and around Carr Hill school. This would exacerbate the difficulties already being experienced by residents parking and the large number of HGVs which use the road. Pedestrians are already at great risk when walking on this road.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
124	12	The character of this area as a peaceful, orderly edge of town/countryside dwelling area will completely change for the worse, especially for the many elderly residents in the area.
124	13	It seems to me that what is required in Retford is more jobs, not houses. Especially for young people.
124	14	Travelling around the district it seems to me that development around Harworth and Bircotes would be more advantageous, especially with many brownfield sites and good roads surrounding the area and industrial estates for job creation.
125	1	Site 4/W9 - Proposed development is not sustainable.
125	2	Site 4/W9 - Access/infrastructure - access from the south (M1) east and west (M1) can only come via town centre or bypass/Retford Road. The number of cars and lorries that 3000 houses and/or industrial development would require would swamp the existing road system.
125	3	Site 4/W9 - The development would also run up to or cover several existing public rights of way which currently run through open countryside and would henceforth run through houses or facilities.
125	4	Site 4/W9 - There is currently no provision for any recreational, educational or commercial activities on this site, again raising issues about traffic volume.
125	5	Site 4/W9 - The rights of way (e.g. Thievesdale Lane bridleway) are currently tree lined with hedgerows - these would be threatened or destroyed.
125	6	Site 9 - Would run up to one side of existing right of way and would require removal of trees/hedges on the current western boundary of the built up area. The setting is an area of open fields and countryside which would be compromised.
125	7	Site 35 - Gateford estate at present suffers from traffic/access issues (e.g. at either end of Ashes Park Ave) - new development would double the size of the estate (and therefore the problem) as access would still be via these two points.
125	8	Site 35 - The proposed new development would also enclose the existing bridleway which runs north towards Audley Lane, obscuring the current open views of fields and woodland and threatening trees and hedgerows.
125	9	Site 153 and 587 - Development here for houses and leisure is an excellent idea, as long as the existing rights of way - National Cycle Route 6 and paths over the pit top - are preserved.
125	10	Site 30 - Development up to existing bridleway which runs towards Mansfield Road would put the existing character of the countryside at risk, as well as trees and hedgerows.
125	11	Site 30 - The Lady Lea Quarry (Notts Wildlife Trust) Nature Reserve is already a focus of anti-social behaviour and fly tipping. Easier access would only exacerbate this issue.
125	12	Sites 195/343/W8 and site 45 - Cut off old road (hedge lined on one side) would be surrounded by these two sides. This is a valuable access route (via the cut off road at Shireoaks Common which runs off the old A57) for walkers and cyclists from the northern end of Worksop to Shireoaks, the canal and surrounding countryside - would this access be preserved or enhanced? e.g. by signposts and the provision of dropped kerbs?
125	13	Site 30 - This area of calcareous grassland (old limestone quarry tips) is a locally and nationally endangered wildlife habitat, supporting plants and flowers not found on many sites. New development would destroy this entirely.
126	1	No, I do not agree that enough land should be allocated in Ranskill for at least 14 houses. Indeed, your own Site Allocations Issues and Options document suggests that only 10 in your earlier sections 10.3 and 10.7. My view is that Ranskill should have an allocation of no higher than 5 houses. My reasons are:
126	2	Since 2006 Ranskill has experienced house building expansion which far exceeds any other village in Bassetlaw (with the exception of North Leverton). The number of houses built in Ranskill has been about one fifth of all houses built in Rural Service Centres.
126	3	Further house building in Ranskill is contentious in the light of recent substantial expansion of the village. The response rate to your questionnaire (39%) is the highest in Bassetlaw. It appears that residents in a number of other villages are rather more relaxed about possible building development, perhaps because previous expansion has been much more limited.
126	4	Approximately two thirds of all those responding to your questionnaire requested no further building beyond infill. The figure in question is the second highest in Bassetlaw and matched only by Sutton and Gamston. The allocation to those villages reflects residents' wishes and these villages have provisionally allocated only 4 and 5 houses respectively.
126	5	the existing provision of affordable housing in Ranskill is already the fourth highest of Bassetlaw Rural Service Centres (11% of housing allocated to A1 Housing). There is already a good match of supply to need for this housing in the village.
126	6	Although windfall infill within the settlement boundary does not fall within your calculations note should be taken of the likely construction of properties within the scope of and held by A1 Housing, currently used as lock-up garages near the park. This is predictable, likely to be affordable and built on a brownfield site.
126	7	Taking account of the above data I would suggest that the allocation be set at the same level as in the case of the other two villages (Sutton and Gamston) which show, like Ranskill, greater than 60% against no further housing. This equates to an allocation of 5.
126	8	If there is felt to be a need to expand the village I suggest site 537 and I suggest that any development of this site be considered late in the timeframe that you are considering, My reasons are: The site has minimum impact on the character of the village.
126	9	It has no impact on good quality agricultural land elsewhere on the periphery of the village.
126	10	It is a site you have described as wasteland. Although not brownfield it has the same character. The preference by residents to avoid greenfield development was made very clear in the questionnaire.
126	11	It is a site which directly mirrors the existing approved development (Persimmon Homes) both in location and character of likely future housing.
126	12	The site offers the potential for further expansion in the future, thereby avoiding ad hoc developments around the village.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
126	13	If the above is not considered to be preferred then consideration should be given to site 516 for an allocation of 2 houses that would retain the character of the property and that area of the village.
126	14	Other aspects of the site are unfavoured. It is greenfield and a larger number of houses would change the character of the immediate area. Access would require careful attention.
126	15	If the above site is considered not to be preferred then consideration should be given to site 157 for an allocation of less than 5 - could be accommodated without appearing out of character with the immediate area, if the properties fronted the road.
126	16	Other aspects of the site are unfavourable. It is greenfield and a larger number of houses would change the character of the immediate area. Access would require careful attention.
126	17	The other sites shown more clearly breach your criteria for selection and demonstrate adverse features. Site 156 is greenfield. Development would result in building out of character with the immediate locality and access would be required with marked impact on the lane. It would affect unnecessarily a lane much used by residents as a popular local rural walk. The site has already been twice turned down for development by BDC and those decisions twice upheld by the Planning Inspectorate. Grounds for those decisions still apply.
126	18	Site 234 is greenfield. It is good quality farming land. Development would affect unnecessarily a lane much used by residents as a popular local rural walk. It would represent a development strongly opposed by residents.
126	19	Site 224 is greenfield. It is good quality farming land. Development, if expanded, could result in suburban sprawl up the hill overlooking the village. It would substantially affect the built character of the village.
126	20	Reference is made to possible uses of section 106 and CIL funding, including possible provision of a village hall. Although in Ranskill there is a desire for good community meeting facilities, two issues should be noted. Firstly, the recent refurbishment of St Barnabas Church includes removal of much fixed furniture leaving a large hall available for village community use. The evidence is of increasing use of the facility, progressively meeting the needs of the community.
126	21	Secondly, the desire for such a facility has for a number of years lain as a secondary preference to the overriding desire of residents that the character of the village should not be changed by additional housing developments on the periphery. As a consequence the housing developments supported by the village have been those on brownfield sites (e.g. Lowfield Close and the current Persimmon development).
127	1	Option B
127	2	Do not agree - no more dwellings in the village, enough infill at the moment and houses that have been built cannot be sold.
127	3	If there is to be extra site 101.
127	4	Traffic from Station Road is already a problem - potential for bad accidents, so no for extra housing.
127	5	Drains have already been 'done' this year and still are not adequate
127	6	We were severely disrupted whilst these were done and now they are extremely "smelly" on Walkeringham Road.
127	7	Site 451 - Walkeringham Road (Site 451) is not wide enough for extra traffic. This is very busy with "speeding traffic" now and to have extra cars would be a disaster - the map does not show a blind spot from Vicarage Lane.
127	8	I think the village should be protected from more building. This is supposed to be a farming community - long gone now. Not a commuting area as the Planner at the meeting suggested.
127	9	No.
127	10	No.
127	11	No, definitely not.
127	12	The original Public House was closed due to lack of interest. Building a new pub, this would go down the same route. Pubs are closing not opening. Lack of support, no money.
128	1	Cannot see any benefit whatsoever
128	2	Site 399 - alongside the A616 offers an attractive tree lined aspect as one enters the lovely village of Cuckney. It would be a shame to even consider making any change that would affect the appearance of this particular area of the village - for what benefit or gain?!!
129	1	Sites 369, 482, 589 - all these sites flood.
129	2	Sites 369, 482, 589 - access on to Retford Road too near keep left sign - dangerous near school entrance.
129	3	Sites 369, 482, 589 - Fumes from motorway.
129	4	Sites 369, 482, 589 - Dead trees near side, dangerous
129	5	Site 266 - Right of way through the site should not be blocked.
129	6	Site 266 - Dangerous for children entering the site to go to the playing field
129	7	Site 266 - Fumes from motorway
129	8	Site 266 - Banking from motorway is dangerous
129	9	Site 266 - Will obstruct widening of the motorway
129	10	Site 266 - Access from the site on to Retford Road is dangerous because of lack of view.
129	11	Site 266 - Several deaths on Retford Road due to traffic.
129	12	Site 266 - Perimeter of site walked for 50 years.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
129	13	Site 214 - Low wires from pylons dangerous.
129	14	Site 214 - Access from site not suitable.
129	15	Consider the school and the Doctors for the extra capacity.
129	16	Consider the high Council Tax in Blyth
129	17	Any more housing in Blyth is not suitable - do not spoil a rural village.
129	18	When considering if or not to grant planning permission is this going to end up an American sub-prime situation?
130	1	I refer to the current consultation process regarding the above. This issue was again discussed at the November meeting of the Parish Councils and I have been asked to confirm that insofar as housing development is concerned with the Parish, the Council wishes to support the proposals for the development envisaged at Langold Park and does not wish to support the designation of any other sites within the Parish at the current time.
131	1	With the current developments and required allocations for Retford I would not be in favour of further allocations.
131	2	I would prefer sights 3-27-370-511 for development for housing.
131	3	I would prefer sights 51-R7 for development for employment in the future.
131	4	I do not support the idea of mixed sites, but sites 51-R7 are a continued of the current developments in the area.
131	5	I would like to bring to your attention that sites 40-52-1-41-364 are used for a variety of crops over the year, the government is pushing for the country to purchase locally sourced produce.
131	6	Site 41 appears to have high water course as the field floods regularly.
131	7	Also sites 259-R2-364 have produced several historical artefacts as displayed in the local Museum.
131	8	I feel that the further development of sites 41-364-1-52-40-259-R2 would be to demanding on the local community i.e. the school has a limited capacity, the village has nothing to offer the younger generation during their leisure time, limited public support.
131	9	I do agree with protecting the green sites. The area covered by 41-364-259-R2 have many rights of way which are walked extensively by the public. Again, the government is encouraging the public to take more exercise, if these sites are developed it would restrict the enjoyment of the public.
131	10	I would not like to see sites 24-44 developed due to the possibility of flooding.
131	11	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
131	12	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
131	13	There will be a significant loss of amenity
131	14	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
131	15	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
131	16	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
132	1	I don't wish to see any new houses in Beckingham.
132	2	The village has already been split with all the recent new builds
132	3	The sewers are inadequate, with recent major problems along Low Street
132	4	Many houses are available and for sale.
132	5	None
132	6	A public house is not needed. Wake up and see all the current pub closures.
132	7	In my view, all the proposed sites should be protected - stop spoiling or village and start listening to what the majority of people really want, or is this just another paper exercise to tick all the required boxes.
132	8	REMOVED
133	1	Taking note of the enclosed plan, I think plots 246-248-249 are no go sites.
133	2	249 is too large for a small village
133	3	246 is putting too much traffic on to Yew Tree Road, plus only one entry/exit no other if required by emergency vehicles.
133	4	248 would be equal to half the existing size of the village at present.
133	5	247 would fulfil the governments requirements for the foreseeable future.
134	1	Yes
134	2	Option A
134	3	Yes, but only 6 (too much building has already taken place recently and infrastructure already under stress).
134	4	Site 451 - to prevent overcrowding existing properties and maintain a village, would feel for existing and new residents.
134	5	Yes, the site must be kept for a pub only. As dictated by the planning appeal officers.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
134	6	The drains! The main sewage drain on station Road/Low Street was blocked and backed up to within grounds of the Green only 10 days ago. The consideration of new housing in the vicinity is already adjusting to this burden. I consider site 451 to be the most suitable site for development.
134	7	Yes, all open spaces should be protected.
134	8	By developing and improving existing sites, access to the school and health checks on a regular basis has a better change for those who are in residence on them.
134	9	Separate transit sites are probably better, due to the nature of the equipment (plant) of the showmen and travellers.
134	10	Sorry - No.
135	1	Option A
135	2	No more building in Beckingham
135	3	See Above
135	4	Pub is the centre point in the village - we have too many new properties that do not suit the village.
135	5	No.
135	6	REMOVED
135	7	REMOVED
136	1	We agree with the screening methodology
136	2	Current housing appears more than adequate as there are unsold new build properties already in the town. I agree that there should be an effort to provide more employment growth by the increase of industrial areas. If housing is allowed to grow more than industry, Retford would risk becoming a dormitory town.
136	3	Areas 10, 70, 71 and 342 should be developed for housing in the first instance, and over and above greenfield sites.
136	4	Sites 51 and R7 should be developed for employment as they are close to the already existing Hallcroft industrial estate, and the Randell Way complex.
136	5	We support sites 51 and R7 as mixed use. There is already housing adjoining the south-east edge of the site, and extended housing development would therefore be easier than a total new development site. This would leave sufficient space for a sizable industrial area providing much-needed local employment.
136	6	There are issue with potential development sites 37, 512 and probably the Longholme Farm development area 533,7,46,309 to the north of Retford, east of the river: Traffic Generation - the amount and type of traffic along Tiln Lane is a major concern. Large and heavy lorries already have to use Tiln Lane as an access to Gainsborough due to the low bridge at Welham.
136	7	Road Safety - this is a major issue already because Carr Hill School is located on Tiln Lane. The school run traffic causes severe congestion, and the mixture of school children, heavy lorries and manoeuvring cars could be a lethal combination.
136	8	Parking provision - is very limited along Tiln Lane and any increase in traffic would compound the problem.
136	9	At other times, vehicles regularly exceed the speed limit along Tiln Lane, especially going out of Retford towards Clarbrough. The 30mph limit would have to be extended to the right-hand bend on to Smeth Lane, (and it would still be ignored).
136	10	Trees and Hedgerows - There could be a loss of trees and hedgerows along the south-west border of area 37. This is the boundary between Bolham Manor and Bolham Lane which is mature woodland edge and hedgerow. This area supports wildlife species such as owls (Tawny and Little), and is a corridor for several species of bat. We have regularly monitored the bats with our heterodyne detector, and have identified pippestrelle, (common and soprano) and Daubenton's.
136	11	Infrastructure - At present, there is inadequate infrastructure in the north-east area of Retford to support any large-scale housing developments. There are only two small convenience outlets at the garage on Moorgate which would be insufficient to support the potential growth in population of this area. Most people would therefore have to use their cars to shop in Retford itself, thus causing more traffic congestion, and major parking issues in the town. The junction of Moorgate and Tiln Lane already causes delays, and the increase in traffic would only make the problem worse. It may well have to be made into a light-controlled junction.
136	12	Flood Risk - The land identified as site 37 slopes down from north-west to south-east. During heavy rains, the runoff coming from the southeastern border of site 37. Bolham Lane is already a flood risk on the Environment Agency Flood Maps. Any increase in housing could cause an increased risk of flooding as there will be no soak facility of the existing field. Flooding could even occur over the top of the sandstone cliff onto Bolham Lane and the houses beneath this ridge.
136	13	Stability of ground: the sandstone escarpment beneath area 37 already has some vae systems in it, and any building work above these systems could result in subsidence, and the compromise of the stability of the sandstone cliff itself.
136	14	Green space should always be considered as a premium asset in any urban development and therefore as many as possible should be protected.
136	15	Only as a last resort should the open spaces be developed as housing/employment areas. Enhancement as recreational/leisure area should take priority.
137	1	Yes
137	2	No
137	3	H6-309,6,69,342,27,488,489,511,370,336,71 - All based on access to main roads
137	4	Do not wish to see 533 included as this would necessitate that Durham Grove be opened up by John Lacey, which would impact on our quiet street. There are access problems due to tight and narrow bends as you enter. Also extra cars would make an already junction at Moorgate Hill/Tiln Lane worse. Our road is ok for its present use but not for potentially younger drivers who would not take the care we do.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
137	5	The drains back up in prolonged heavy rain, extra houses would make it worse.
137	6	51 and R7 if split as shown on enclosed map.
137	7	259 and R2 if better access to A1 could be achieved.
137	8	512 and 37 have access to Moorgate Hill junction problems, apart from that no objection.
137	9	Yes
137	10	No, the more open spaces the better.
137	11	Option A
137	12	Existing sites, to keep the mess they create in one space and not spread all over our area.
137	13	No firm opinion
137	14	None known
138	1	Agree, if need can be proved
138	2	yes, 19 and 12
138	3	160 and 161
138	4	Yes, most certainly
138	5	Around existing sites to lesson the impact on residents
138	6	Together, same reason as above.
138	7	No comment
139	1	Screening methodology appears to be through and sound
139	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
139	3	Four is a very conservative figure and will not create a negative impact on the character of the village.
139	4	The sites most suitable for a small development are those adjoining an existing road where new houses would essentially to infill
139	5	Suggest 274 or the fringes of 275 and 452 which adjoin Town Street and Lound New Road.
139	6	As indicated in response to Q114, small-scale development can be achieved by 'infill' adjoining an existing road or by developing a 'brownfield' site if agricultural buildings are no longer required. Some large open spaces should be retained within the confines of the village for grazing horses, small holdings or similar usage.
139	7	Existing sites - if that is practical and feasible. Alternatively, sites adjoining the A1 or other similar locations if required.
140	1	I would not like to see additional growth in Carlton or Langold on the scale shown on the map. We have had new developments in Carlton on the old school site off Long Lane and the site on Doncaster Road at the bottom of Rotherham Baulk in recent years. This has grown the size of our village.
140	2	I understand a few houses are to be built at North House Farm on the green, but I have not objection to this as buildings are already there and it is better to have houses there than to let the site fall into disrepair. Also the numbers of houses proposed is only 5 (If i understand your map correctly) and this would not impact our village.
140	3	I also do not object to the development at Firbeck Colliery as the area has become a dumping ground and is frankly a mess. It would be better to have the area redeveloped than for it to continue to be derelict. However, this development is a large one and will bring many more people to our area. I feel this will be enough.
140	4	Carlton and Langold are villages and too much expansion would stop them being so. Also looking at the proposed potential housing areas on the map Carlton would nearly double in size and Langold would grow by half. How is this going to impact on the village schools which could not cope with this much growth. Are we to have a new school built or expand the existing ones?
140	5	Also I am concerned about traffic through the village. People heading for the motorways would use Rotherham Baulk and Owday Lane. These are essentially country roads not meant for large volumes of traffic. Then there are the village services such as the Doctor's Surgery, could they accept so many new people, the buses through our village which are overcrowded most of the time - could they cope with more passengers?
140	6	Also if these potential housing areas are built, Carlton and Langold would cease to be the villages they are today. Most people live in a village because they want to live in a village not a town or city and I think too much expansion would spoil our villages.
140	7	The green spaces we have in Carlton that are used as play areas for children should be protected as we do not have enough of them.
140	8	Too much expansion would grow our villages so they would become more like a town.
141	1	Yes - I agree
141	2	Option B - Worksop
141	3	Yes - I agree
141	4	Area 281 - Poor road access elsewhere
141	5	No
141	6	Yes -from a visual point of view - the village currently has a rural feel and any infill would increase 'urbanism'.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
141	7	Additionally, road access to most of the sites would pose difficulties from a safety point of view.
141	8	Existing sites should be developed wherever possible - generally lower cost and less public outcry.
141	9	Some sites on cost and despoilment grounds.
141	10	None known.
142	1	In section 11.2 the table shows that the existing space pitch capacity, as of 196 July 2011, was 38 pitches. In section 11.3 the need assessment made back in December 2005 showed there would be a shortfall in pitches of 43 in the future. I don't quite understand these figures because almost six years after the assessment was made, there is still a good deal of space capacity on existing sites.
142	2	As stated above, I cannot see the need for more sites. However, if there is, I think extra pitches arise by encouraging existing sites or building others near to them. Extending the site would be the most cost effective solution mainly because of the provision of shared services and the time and money spent in looking for new sites that comply with the appropriate legislation.
142	3	I think that transient and residential sites should be located together because it must be easier for the Council to control and administer fewer sites. The opportunity for cost saving measures also exist e.g. supplies of electric and water.
143	1	Option A
143	2	Yes
143	3	303 first choice, 398 second choice
143	4	Flooding regularly occurs on Budby Road at the junction with Old Mill Lane.
143	5	Yes
143	6	On and around existing sites
143	7	REMOVED
144	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
144	2	Disagree with any new developments as a) it spoils the character of the village
144	3	b) Increased traffic on all roads
144	4	c) Brownfield sites should be used first.
144	5	d) Less green space in the village
144	6	e) Limited bus service operates through the village
144	7	None Known.
144	8	Village has no football/sports areas or play ground for youngsters
144	9	Earmarked sites should be protected from any building development
144	10	Gypsy/Traveller sites should be concentrated on existing sites. More facilities could be provided on those sites
144	11	As above (answer to question 122)
144	12	No
145	1	The methodology appears to be reasonable although I would have preferred to see all existing development within the settlement over the past 5 years included in the overall plan to reflect significant changes during that period. Some villages have had minimal growth others have seen rather more. Beckingham falls within the latter category experiencing 33 new builds including 17 low cost properties. Currently, there is planning for a further 7 and yet 40 properties remain for sale in the village.
145	2	Option A, providing sustainable employment is available to support significant growth.
145	3	As illustrated in Q1 there exists planning permission for a further 7 homes, five of which are on one plot. I would suggest this meets the overall wish of the parish to see on average only 6 new properties built. I do not therefore, support any further land allocation for building with the exception of site 101.
145	4	In considering the map of Beckingham I do not support any new site allocations within the actual village itself. The character of the village has been seriously eroded by poor planning decisions in the 1960's allowing dense somewhat unattractive developments that detract from the rural scene.
145	5	In particular, Low Street contains many old and historic properties and I would be pleased to see some consideration being given to listing some of the area together with parts of Toll Bar Road North and parts of High Street. Conservation status is one way of assisting future developments to be aesthetically pleasing.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
145	6	Site 106, the site approved for a public house is controversial. Despite the applicant winning the appeal on March 15th 2011 at great public cost, I now understand that the applicant wishes to revisit the original site turned down on appeal which is closer to the village hall. The parish council, who are the applicants, not the landowners, appear to be considering taking unreasonable action in this respect, insofar as they have already been granted permission to erect a public house acting, they say, in the best interest of the village based on a dated and poorly researched survey. Since the granting of this application breeched the village envelope they deliberately opened the way forward for the land owner for the landowner to, predictably, decide he no longer wishes to build a pub there but now houses. Forgive my cynicism, but it was so transparent that the landowner never intended to build a pub but use the Parish Council as a vehicle on which to ride his aspirations. Revisiting the original site with all attendant costs will have exactly the same outcome. Therefore, I most strongly do not support the site numbered 106 being used for anything other than a village pub. If this is not viable, as it clearly is not in the current climate, then planning permission will just have to lapse.
145	7	There is a lack of social housing for young families in the village. Perhaps the site adjacent to the village green, already approved for 5 houses, could be considered for this use to enable less affluent families to join the village or remain if they were born here.
145	8	The green and The Spinney ought to have protected status, both are within the control of the Parish Council. Similarly, I would suggest that the whole site adjacent to site 106 (pub), extending to sites 203 & 105 are given protected status to ensure the density of the village is not further increased.
145	9	I have considerable working experience with Gypsies and Travellers. I have found that generally they do not wish to be integrated within communities. Rather, they prefer to establish their own sites that are within travelling distance of school and facilities. I am unaware what research has been done by BDC to ascertain if further sites are required but if work has been carried out to show that gypsies and travellers have a need to settle in the Parish then I would suggest that the site adjacent to the Trent Port Pub be investigated. I understand that this is privately owned by a person in London. From time to time, the travellers do make use of this land for temporary sites and for the dumping of garden detritus. I believe the Police may be investigating the unauthorised use of the land, but it might be suitable for formal development for say, then pitches with attendant wash houses. I am sure that BDC would wish to consult with the gypsy and traveller liaison workers and gypsy council to establish what they prefer rather than others determining sites for them. It would be unfortunate if sites were built that are then unused as has happened in neighbouring Lincolnshire.
145	10	I do not therefore, support any further land allocation for building with the exception of site 101. This could, providing road traffic hazards are eliminated and new drainage is installed, support an attractive mixed development of housing and overall improve an industrial site.
146	1	I agree with and commend you on the scope of your screening criteria
146	2	With consultation out to 20 proposed Rural Service Centres the consideration of redistribution to more urban centres is premature.
146	3	I agree with the proposed RSC distribution and believe that the 14 additional houses allocated to Walkeringham can be accommodated within the capacity of the pumped sewage disposal system.
146	4	I am surprised to see sites 51/1, 51/2 and 51/3 on the Walkeringham map listed as potential protected open spaces since Walkeringham 26 village envelope map, circulated earlier, shows these sites, respectively the Children's playground. The playing field and the primary school, together with the Church yard and the Cemetery, as protected open space. If they are not currently protected, they should be.
146	5	With two exceptions, the proposals for development are disproportionate to the size of the village. Implementation of the proposals in full would totally alter the character of the village and would require extensive additions to the pumped sewage disposal system.
146	6	My comments on individual proposals are as follows: site 438 - The lower part of the site adjacent to North Moor Road is subject to flooding in severe weather events.
146	7	Site 294 - The lower part of the site adjacent to High Street, is likely to be subject to flooding in severe weather events. Any road from the site to High Street would require additional culverting of the moor drain.
146	8	Sites 293 and 438 - It would be desirable to avoid any egress from site 293 on to the sharp bend in the A161 ROAD. If development of site 293 and/or site 438 entailed egress onto Mill Baulk Road the speed limit on that road should be reduced from 40mph to 30 mph to facilitate road safety.
146	9	Site 366 - Unless the adjacent section of Bird croft Lane was widened from a single carriageway any egress from this site would have to be to the A161 Beckingham Road.
146	10	Sites 437, 438, 442 and 445 - If all of these sites were developed the character of the village would be altered due to the potentially large numbers of houses proposed.
146	11	Site 442 - Access to this site would be difficult. The potential agree to the A161 would be on a bend with restricted sight lines.
146	12	Site 445 - As shown on the Walkeringham 26 sheet, the section of this field which is adjacent to the Moor Drain is subject to flooding. Incidentally, the indication of the flood plain on the Walkeringham 26 sheet is parallel to the railway towards the sewage works is incorrect. The railway line is in a cutting at this point and the sewage works are on higher ground. Should the sewage works flood from the River Trent, most of Walkeringham, including the whole of the Fox Covert development, would be under water to first floor level.
146	13	My comments are related to site 481 which is within the Walkeringham boundary. The existing development sites at Fox Covert in Walkeringham and the Newalls site in Misterton are both to the East of the low railway bridge on Fox Covert Lane and have unrestricted vehicular access.
146	14	Should site 481 and one or more of the Misterton sites 87, 201 and 202 be fully developed, vehicular access would be restricted by the low bridge on Fox Covert Lane and by the constriction at Wharf bridge. If all four sites were developed fully, with over 500 additional houses, it is probable that the unrestricted access road, Gravel Holes Lane, would require a major upgrade to take the additional volume of traffic.
147	1	Yes

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
147	2	Option A
147	3	I think that there should be more housing within the village over the next 20 years.
147	4	164 and 165 as they are a natural extension to the existing village.
147	5	The play area needs upgrading
147	6	Existing sites
147	7	Together
148	1	I can not find out what the screening methodology is
148	2	Option A
148	3	I do not believe any further houses should be built until it is known that the infrastructure in place can actually handle what is present and being built.
148	4	As above
148	5	The infrastructure re services should be improved, to allow the village to blossom.
148	6	Agreed
148	7	REMOVED
148	8	Together. Less locations to maintain.
148	9	REMOVED
149	1	Yes
149	2	Option A
149	3	No - because there are already a number of existing houses for sale, more new houses are just being built and additional houses are in planning to be built.
149	4	None
149	5	This location is a poor choice for building a public house and any pub sited here is unlikely to be economically viable as there will be little passing traffic and local residents will not support this venture on their own. Please see answer to Question 36 about housing site.
149	6	No
149	7	Yes
149	8	Existing sites - as they will already have appropriate infrastructure and facilities.
149	9	No opinion.
149	10	None
150	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
150	2	No, at least 25 more houses some for first time buyers.
150	3	504 & 505
150	4	The split indicated on the map
150	5	No.
150	6	Yes
150	7	No, there are sufficient sites provided
150	8	Separately, as static and transit would not mix
150	9	None
150	10	Yes
151	1	Yes
151	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
151	3	Disagree, at least 25-30 more properties built - some of these for first time buyers
151	4	504 & 505
151	5	The split indicated on the map
151	6	No
151	7	Yes
151	8	Not in or near Misson, there are enough sites in other places
151	9	Separately, static and transit do not mix
151	10	None
152	1	Yes

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
152	2	Option A
152	3	I agree.
152	4	I support the development of Corner Farm (171)
152	5	Flood lit play area
152	6	Open spaces should be protected, sites 120 and 258 should become an open space
152	7	Concentrated around existing sites
153	1	Broadly agree with the methodology
153	2	Option A
153	3	Agree that a maximum of 6 houses will be adequate
153	4	Prefer to see sites 101 or 107 developed.
153	5	Agreed site for public house should be protected unless the PH could be relocated next to the village hall which would provide more adequate space and parking.
153	6	Is the drainage system adequate for any further development?
153	7	The Open Space shown on the map should all be protected
153	8	Gypsy and Traveller sites should be concentrated around existing sites
153	9	Transit and residential pitches should be separate this would help with maintenance and removal/resitting if necessary
153	10	We do not know of any sites that might be suitable for Gypsy and Traveller sites
153	11	Site 496 would have potentially dangerous access and would extend boundary of settlement too much.
153	12	Site 451 is too far away from settlement
154	1	I consider the allocation is low and therefore does not give enough flexibility or choice. Additional allocation also maintains pressure on keeping land prices down. This would also help provide low cost housing and perhaps self build. I suggest that the allocation should be doubled and more (not larger) sites allocated.
154	2	Site 115 is suitable for low cost/ self build subject to ensuring design takes into account road noise from the A1.
154	3	No specific employment land is allocated in Tuxford. The town is well located for development and the Council should be encouraging job growth. The wording on page 56 is vague - if there was any opportunity.... I consider the wording/ policy should be more proactive -'we will encourage the expansion of employment opportunities.... Also the plan needs to look further into the longer term where employment is considered.
155	1	Agree
155	2	Yes, those 19 houses would be sufficient development for Hayton - but the location is poor.
155	3	160 - but with fewer than the suggested maximum potential.
155	4	No
155	5	Yes, they should be protected.
155	6	No strong opinion, but a quiet village location with limited facilities does not seem very sustainable.
155	7	No strong opinion.
156	1	I Agree
156	2	Yes, I believe Tuxford should be allocated more housing growth to deliver additional benefits to the town. The town is ideally situated next to the A1.
156	3	124
156	4	No.
156	5	No, we need more development in this area.
156	6	Option A
156	7	Concentrated in and around existing sites
156	8	No Comment
156	9	No Comment
157	1	We believe six new houses is more than enough due to planning permission being granted to sites still undeveloped in the village.
157	2	The Southern part of the village has been developed to a degree that a lot of the properties built have not been sold. Therefore, we believe the site 451 at the north end of the village could be considered as an alternative.
157	3	Site 106 has planning permission for a public house considered this was the second choice we believe the original site near to the village hall was the ideal site as all the local recreation activities take place there.
157	4	Site 106 as a building site would be a further strain on the sewage system which at present is at total capacity. Also the site has a fuel pipe line remaining length of the site this would need investigating.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
158	1	I agree that there should be land allocated for at least 13 new houses.
158	2	No, my view would not change considering the 9 dwellings recently started, and the 5 proposed affordable houses.
158	3	I would like plot 296 to be developed in the future. It would provide sensitive and appropriate infill to the village. Also the development would be in character, similar to previous small developments which have enhanced the village.
159	1	We would agree that enough land should be allocated for at least 14 new homes up until 2028.
159	2	Walkeringham is a substantial settlement which provides a good level of services and facilities supporting some everyday needs. Allowing for some small-scale development would help to sustain the local community.
159	3	The village would be able to support such growth in relation to its current infrastructure.
159	4	Any design for future housing should reflect the nature of the village.
159	5	Site 547 should be considered for development in the future as it provides an opportunity to access an underused area of land to create a sympathetic development with a clear curtilage line without encroaching into the open countryside.
159	6	A development on this site could be spaciouly designed, compatible with its surroundings and meet the plot character of this particular area.
159	7	In terms of it suitability for housing the site is in walking distance of the village services and facilities including school, post office, village hall, church, playing field, public house and public transport.
159	8	The impact on and benefit to the community would be availability to Bassetlaw District Council in achieving the housing target for the Rural Service Centres. Site 349 and part of site 294 would also seem appropriate for consideration together with site 547.
159	9	The allocation of these sites would only require minor realignment of the settlement boundary without harming the visual character of the village or countryside.
159	10	We would like to make the District Council aware of a fuel pipeline at the site reference 442 crossing the site northwards from station road to the fuel depot on the A161.
159	11	We take the view that open space site reference 51/2 and 51/3 should be protected from any future development proposals as these sites are vital to the local community.
160	1	Yes
160	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
160	3	Disagree - at least 25 more properties and some for first time buyers
160	4	The split indicated on map
160	5	No
160	6	Yes
160	7	REMOVED
160	8	Separate - static and transit would not mix
160	9	None
161	1	Firstly, the Council does not believe that Tuxford should be allocated more housing growth above that already required. (Question 26)
161	2	Secondly, the Council believes that all the areas of open space identified on the map in the consultation document should be protected from any future development. The Council considers that the small area of open space in the centre of the Burleigh Court development, which is not shown on the map, should also be protected. The Council is puzzled by the inclusion of two areas of the Market Place shown as areas of open space on the map as these are actually areas of pavement! (Question 29)
161	3	Thirdly, the Council has considered each site in turn and would like to make the following specific comments on the identified sites: 115 – the Council has previously commented that the ‘availability conclusion cost factors’ in the SHLAA report should be the same as those for 121 regarding noise from the A1.
161	4	The Council has two major concerns about the development on these sites on Lincoln Road. First, intensive development would destroy the rural aspect of the valley; second, the flood risk on the Northern edge of the sites next to the beck. This site should only be considered for a limited amount of housing development.
161	5	This site should not be considered for housing – it is too big, too far from the town centre and would encourage the town to sprawl outwards.
161	6	It is considered that this site is suitable but would be better earmarked for small commercial/industrial growth.
161	7	The Council considers this site to be suitable for housing
161	8	The Council does not consider these sites suitable for housing. Building on them would destroy the view from the South across to the Windmill.
161	9	114, 492 & 495 – The Council considers these sites to be suitable for housing
161	10	490 – The Council considers this site to be suitable for housing and at least partial industrial development as site 122 above.
161	11	493 – The Council does not consider this site to be suitable for housing. It is considered too close to the junction of Ashvale Road to provide safe access or egress to property.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
161	12	494 & 518 - The Council does not consider either of these sites to be suitable for housing. Both sites are too far out of Tuxford and would create an imbalance in development.
161	13	The Council therefore considered that the sites it preferred to see developed in the future were, in order of preference, 126, 235, 490,122 and 115.
161	14	Finally, development in Tuxford should be considered in the light of topography and not just plan. In the right place development can have a small visual impact and be very positive, for example the Walkers industrial estate in Tuxford which is hardly noticeable 'hidden' as it is in the bottom of the valley. However, in the wrong place development can have a major visual impact, for example the warehouse near the Red House junction on the A1 north of Doncaster is sited on the top of a hill and can be seen for miles in all directions.
162	1	The site is included within your November 2011, Issues and Options consultation for East Markham, and I can confirm that we have no objection to the proposed screening methodology.
162	2	Regarding the consideration of allocations of the housing target in Rural Service Centres, we would disagree with any reduction from the current proposed proportion. The current proposal of 11 housing units over that proposed on the former factory site appears extremely restrictive over the life of the allocation. This could restrict the potential for retention of and the improvement to local services, and therefore suggest that a level of flexibility be allowed for housing numbers, dependent upon settlement needs. My clients site on Beckland Hill, defined above is included within your Issues and Options Consultation Document as a site for potential housing, together with 20 other potential sites. Inevitably, we have reviewed the other sites included, but shall not comment upon other sites individual potential. We have though analysed sites status and position in relation to the current development boundary.
162	3	Fourteen of the sites identified sit on the extremity or beyond the developed area and all are outside the boundary line. ONE CONSIDERED WORTHY OF RETENTION AS OPEN SPACE WITHIN THE conservation area. Other sites are partially within the boundary and or contained within existing developed areas.
162	4	My clients site is one of these latter sites, where it is currently outside and adjacent to the development boundary line, with residential development immediately adjacent to the north, west and south, with the large brownfield to the east, now with a resolution to grant residential development consent. Subsequently, this site is/shall be entirely contained within residential development forming an island within the village developed areas.
162	5	The open space review has not identified this land as potential for open space, for a number of reasons, not least that it is under private ownership, with no public access or use. My clients site is also outside the Conservation Area, neither is it adjacent to the area. In fact the land is considerable beyond the area, and separated from it by existing development and brownfield land.
162	6	My clients land's inclusion within the latest SHLAA assesses the site as follows: MAY BE SUITABLE, MAY BE AVAILABLE, IS ACHIEVABLE, and, with a potential CAPACITY of 14 dwellings. In terms of delivery and housing trajectory the draft SHLAA indicates that 14 dwellings could be developable in the 6-10 year Delivery tranche.
162	7	We would consider that the site IS SUITABLE for residential development. The site has frontage to Beckland Hill for the development of individual plots, with specific confirmation of access principle approval from Notts Highways Department. The site is not included within the open space proposal. Heritage assets are referred, however, I am unaware of any specific heritage asset affecting the development potential of this site.
162	8	We also consider that the site IS AVAILABLE for development. The land is surplus to the owners requirements and they have sought professional advice about the potential for site promotion and subsequent development. Indeed, there is no technical reason why this site could not be developed within the 0-5 year timeframe if needed to meet five year housing supply requirement for Bassetlaw.
162	9	We AGREE that the residential development of the site IS ACHIEVABLE. Initial feasibility studies have been undertaken and it is currently considered that the site can be developed without major cost implication or adverse environmental impact.
162	10	This site is currently redundant and vacant, with no current beneficial use to the owner or the settlement and is locked within existing development. I believe that on conclusion of the site allocations and options process it would be logical to included the adjacent brownfield site just granted resolution to approve residential development within the development boundary. At that point my clients land shall be contained within the built up form of the village, within the settlement development boundary, outside the Conservation Area, accessible and readily developable.
163	1	Yes, I agree
163	2	I would like to see the sites situated around Rhodesia developed as proposed, the village could do with more development - is there any chance of a Doctor's Surgery? This could be an asset to our school and local shop if the proposals go ahead. It is not before time!
163	3	Numbers 30 and 90 (Old Dormer Tools Site)
163	4	The Vesuvius site
163	5	I would like to see a mixture of affordable houses and bungalows, to give young people a chance to buy at a reasonable price.
163	6	Yes
163	7	No, not that I can think of?
163	8	Yes
163	9	Option B, Worksop, get it back to what it once was, a lovely thriving market town.
163	10	REMOVED
163	11	Together, group them all in one area

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
163	12	I Don't know of any land available
164	1	Option A
164	2	No houses should be allowed in the village
164	3	No
164	4	Would not like development, but if so, on sites 246 and 247 as they are on a bus route, school and shop.
164	5	Elkesley does not have the infrastructure to support a big housing development
164	6	Yes, sites 248 and 249 should be protected from housing
164	7	REMOVED
164	8	REMOVED
164	9	REMOVED
165	1	The population of Retford will increase by over 50% from 21,000 to 32-33,000. Nearly 4,000 extra school places will have to be found. There will be nearly 4,00 extra cars.
165	2	In consequence, the character of the town will be massively altered.
165	3	Local infrastructure will be seriously stressed
165	4	Traffic levels will increase overall by some 50%
165	5	There will be substantial loss of amenity and wildlife habitat from development of greenfields.
166	1	I accept that 4 new houses should be built provided they are affordable to first time buyers and/or meet a social need.
166	2	Site 282, not 2 houses but 4 single occupancy units designed to look like 2 houses
166	3	Sites 274,299,276,452,275 houses to be built on any one of these sites would a) overload the village roads and increase the hazard of several bends.
166	4	b) There is inadequate infrastructure to support these sites
166	5	c) Postwar development in Sutton took away 25 + acres of productive farm land (one acre = 4 allotment large enough to support a family's need for vegetables for one year). The sites in deep orange (except site 536) are all good food processing land. The world population is increasing, as is the UK population. At present, the UK is 55% self sufficient in food compared with 90% in the war. As standards of living rise in the Asian and 3rd world countries, they will want to use more of their own produce and not export it. Therefore the UK will need to become more self sufficient than it is today. Farm land must be protected for the sake of future generations.
166	6	d) Developing these sites would mean loss of landscapes, ecological sites, trees, hedgerows, and open spaces which are psychosocial refreshing.
166	7	e) There is no work in the village so people coming to live on these sites would have to commute, thus increasing traffic problems and pollution.
166	8	f) I know of no overcrowded families in Sutton and a number of houses are already for sale in the village.
167	1	We disagree, the 68 homes being built are more than sufficient (already increasing village housing by nearly 20%) in terms of infrastructure, traffic and general rural character of Gringley on the Hill.
167	2	No additional sites should be developed
167	3	With reference to site 134, the greenfield area should be protected and should never be developed.
167	4	We agree that the open places identified on the map and all other green spaces in the village should be protected from any future development proposals.
168	1	Accepting that 'screening methodology' criteria are those criterion 1 to 9 in stage 2 identifying sites - Yes. However, this 'traffic light system' of scoring potential sites in Elkesley would appear to be in conflict with the potential constraints discovered in stage 1.
168	2	Option A, it is considered that Elkesley today does not fulfil enough of the criteria to be a RSC.
168	3	I have not seen the feedback from Elkesley residents. On current demand, taking into account village infrastructure, and with several new houses not selling, it is not believed Elkesley needs any excessive development other than minor infill plots of less than 11 houses.
168	4	No, this open greenfield site is in the heart of the village (site 247) and as such should be protected as a community asset.
168	5	If housing must be considered on this site, it should be limited and look to making provisions for leisure amenities such as a bowling green and/or a tennis court.
168	6	Sites 246 and 248
168	7	List of village assets: The post office is now closed and it is unclear if one will reopen, the village pub is up for sale, it is hoped that this remain a pub again, but it is unclear; there are currently some 13 properties for sale in the village. Several are long term offers. Let properties are also show to move. It is evident that Elkesley is not seen as a desirable location, as a result of several factors. Therefore, any excessive development of houses would not appear attractive.
168	8	Due to a reduction in village 'assets', a limited infrastructure and poor public transport facilities to local services such as hospitals, doctor's surgeries and shopping it is not believed Elkesley fulfils your criteria to be classed as a RSC.
168	9	In addition, it is believed that site 247 should also be protected as previously stated. In addition, this site, as noted in the SHLAA report is greenfield, is a site of potential archaeological interest, is a heritage asset and has previously been refused an application for development of an excessive nature such as that which is being proposed again.
168	10	Around existing sites connected services already present.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
168	11	Together - site services/facilities provide for both.
169	1	I do not agree to more new dwellings before any further development commences in the rural village of Blyth. Couldn't existing boarded up dwellings be refurbished within the Bassetlaw area?
169	2	If 9 dwellings were built, I suggest plot 178, 590 or 266 purely because access onto Retford Road or Bawtry Road would be preferable to access on Spital Road (no. 214, 213) where traffic speeds off the A1 through the village, I feel building anymore houses closer to the exit would be unsafe.
169	3	Look at refurbishing existing houses before new builds. Please consider traffic issues, the village does not have any facilities other than a village shop and poor bus services.
169	4	When considering suggested plots in the village, please consider which plots are currently farmed and which are wasteland. Over the Bassetlaw area. Please consider if there are enough plots of land/ refurbishment areas available before farmland is bought.
169	5	With regard to the 38 gypsy and traveller plots I would suggest you extend existing sites.
170	1	There is enough traffic on Ollerton Road now and most traffic that uses that road now disregards the 30mph speed limit. It's a straight road waiting to have an accident, and if you allow any more houses to be built it means more cars.
170	2	I am totally apposed to these houses being built.
171	1	Any additional housing would, I feel, take that 'village' feeling away from Blyth. If this happens, it will be a real shame. I realise that housing is an issue in all parts of the country, but I feel that local areas such as Langold, Carlton, Worksop and Retford all possess enough areas for housing and provide the necessary amenities to cater for this increase of population.
171	2	No, why Blyth? The ripple effect on all aspects of the village would be massive: the shop has just had a huge rebuild, but should these plans go ahead, it would be totally inadequate for the village need; what a waste of money and time. The school is a successful village school and its current building would not support an increase such as the one proposed. The roads an parking are a massive issue, especially on The Green; how would you address this?
171	3	I believe that areas closer to the towns of Retford and Worksop, would be more appropriate for new housing.
172	1	I live at the end of Bigsby Road, Retford overlooking the Idle Valley. I understand that it is proposed to build over 700 houses on the fields facing us, and obviously I would like to protest for the following reasons: This will certainly affect the value of my house
172	2	it will remove an area of varied wildlife. To disfigure the real beauty of this valley which is such an asset to the town with residential housing would be a tragedy.
172	3	The traffic situation where Bigsby Road joins Tiln Lane is already chaotic with huge HGV's, school traffic as well as local traffic. To still add more from this development would be dreadful, highly dangerous and unwise.
172	4	Surely at the present time, Retford has a surfeit of empty housing remaining unsold. They remain unsold because of the lack of jobs and industry in the area which is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future.
172	5	The Council would need to supply services such as school, benefits etc...
173	1	It is with grave concern that I have examined the proposed building sites within Ordsall and adjoining land, particularly sites 42 and 53 - around 1200 houses with 5% employment land and probable provision for gypsy and traveller sites. Apart from destroying the character of Ordsall, I am so concerned that the roads in Ordsall are at a maximum capacity for traffic at present and cannot sustain the addition of extensive new development.
173	2	Ordsall High Street is very difficult to negotiate (especially at night) due to the width of the road and parked cars. The 5 arches bridge at the bottom of the high street is also difficult to negotiate, particularly at peak times, and its structure was not meant to accommodate the volume of traffic now expected of it.
173	3	The whole ethos of this beautiful rural area is being eroded.
173	4	West Hill/ordsall Road, leading up to the mini roundabout junction with the Worksop Road is a terribly busy road at the moment, and would be horrendous with the addition of a huge housing development.
173	5	If people then decided to use the road through Eaton village as an alternative route, then the village would be destroyed - it is already being busy at peak times.
173	6	Eaton is a very attractive village, with the true characteristics of a farming village, complete with, a church, old school house and bridge with the River Idle flowing through it.
173	7	Ordsall infant and primary school would not be able to accommodate the children from such a large housing project, it is already adding numbers from the new Bridon project.
173	8	It is very distressing to see the lovely fields and open spaces which surround Ordsall being destroyed by extensive housing projects -de valuing existing houses, next to the proposed sites and seeing the rural aspect of Ordsall Destroyed.
173	10	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
173	11	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit doers precisely that.
173	12	There will be a significant loss of amenity
173	13	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
173	14	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
173	15	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
174	1	Objection to building on plot 69 opposite to the rear of Brixworth Way Retford.
174	2	We bought our house in 1988 because of the fact it was not overlooked and also my views over Leverton Hill and Grove Wood.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
174	3	On the land in question there is a wealth of flora and fauna which is enjoyed by all. We are able to watch barn owls, sparrowhawks, kestrels and kingfishers along with all the wildlife in an around the area, included the protected voles. We cannot envisage any building taking place between the heavy goods railway line and the canal for many reasons.
174	4	The very close proximity of houses alongside the railway line - surely this is a health and safety issue.
174	5	Access required would lead to more traffic on Welham Road, and the already congested Moorgate Hill.
174	6	The land is low lying and often water logged which would prove to be difficult to service for drainage foul and service water.
174	7	We consider this proposal along with all our neighbours to be very unreasonable and would ask that this potential site to be removed from the plan.
175	1	Enclosed is a DVD of water to the rear of St Stephens Road and St Helens Road as opposition to the field being developed. This field often has lying water to the lowest lying part of the site.
176	1	Yes, I do agree with the criteria in the screening methodology
176	2	The site shown on the map which I would prefer to be developed for housing is site 114. As the owner of the site since 1989, I feel developing site 114 would be a 'rounding off' of the north side of Eldon Street and would mirror the development on the opposite side of the main road. Site 114 is not prone to flooding, has good access to the south east corner of the plot and is classed as having no agricultural value by the Ministry of Agriculture and Fishery. If site 114 could be developed for family housing, with a good design and appropriate materials, i feel this would enhance the visual appearance of the village.
176	3	I think the open spaces identified on the map should be protected from any future development proposals.
177	1	I agree with the community assets (Ranskill)
177	2	Parking close to the shop/post office (which there used to be on the corner of Station Road until the Council - misleadingly, in my opinion, commandeered as pedestrian only would be an advantage.
177	3	Bearing in mind the dictionary definition of 'village' and the lack of parking mentioned above, 14 houses may be reasonable. To extend too far would be changing the whole aspect of a village character. The fact that public transport is limited would increase traffic accordingly too.
177	4	REMOVED
177	5	The smaller sites 516 remains within the current village envelope.
178	1	I agree that enough land should be allocated within Hayton for a modest number of houses between 12 and 30.
178	2	If the potential development of Corner Farm goes ahead with around 20 houses, then I would consider this forms the greater part of what Hayton could absorb. A few other new properties could be fitted in here and there, but my greatest concern is that of sewage disposal. It is a regular occurrence in Hayton that when heavy rain falls, the main sewer overflows. This affects a good number of properties and is well known by Severn Trent. The sewage system in Hayton is pumped but the main sewer has been compromised by subsidence and under capacity. The problem must be addressed before any large number of new properties are added to the locality. It should be noted that amenities in Clarborough/Hayton area are minimal. The Clarborough school is already operating at full capacity and there are now no shops in the area.
178	3	Sites 542, 544 front onto Main Street and could be utilised. Sites 160 and 161 could stand modest development but it is clear that they impinge onto the Chesterfield Canal which is an SSSI.
178	4	Broadband speeds are pathetic in Hayton. If an increase in population could bring and influence onto the improvement of this facility it would be welcome.
178	5	It is absolutely essential that the open spaces marked for Hayton are preserved.
178	6	I think any new gypsy and traveller sites should be extensions to, or kept local to existing sites where integration with local communities is already established.
178	7	I do not why any distinction is made on this topic.
179	1	Please find my views on the planning subjects you are considering between now and 2028. We need jobs for our young people in the area which is almost impossible at the moment. I have 3 granddaughters and 3 grandsons. 2 granddaughters have left the area after unit, one has gone to London. The other is 150 miles with down the A1. still the have to travel a good distance into work, m youngest granddaughter is in unit at Newcastle, my eldest grandson now 26 years of age has been in and out of jobs since leaving unit at Sheffield, as has my second grandson. They also have moved south and still have to travel long distances to work. My youngest grandson is the only one still in Worksop (age 22 years). He works part time in Worksop, though he also has travelled to Mansfield. He is hoping to go abroad next summer. This proves there is “nothing going for them here” after all having a good education. My 2 sons-in-law both work locally, though they have had to travel long distances in the past neither jobs are safe. Two of my daughters are self employed in Worksop, their overheads are enormous including rates which are ridiculously high. My eldest daughter and her husband moved away years ago. My husband and I moved here form Sheffield to start up our own business many years ago. Am sorry to say Worksop has gone down considerably since we came in the early 1960s.
179	2	Regarding homes they are enough sprouting up like weeds. We are now surrounded. No bigger than pocket handkerchiefs all crammed together,
179	3	Regarding gypsy plots that is a definitely a no go area. That is the last thing the planners should be considering.
179	4	If you want to spend the money put aside for the, you should consider spending it on a new bus station. It is years and ears ago was considered and put on hold. Travelling down Hardy Street people line up at the wall, with long faces, shivering in the cold, looking as if they are the next people to be shot.
180	1	I agree to 9 houses being built in Blyth if they are affordable and not more executive homes which we have plenty of. Do not want the floodgates opening to more as infrastructure cannot cope.
180	2	Sites 176 or 482,369,589, I feel any other sites are too close to busy slip roads or the Ranskill turnoff were vehicles often speed.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
180	3	Please look at other sites available in Bassetlaw, in other towns. Blyth only has one shop and a limited bus service. Refurbishing existing boarded up premises ? Do you look at the land and rate it whenever it is used or not? With regard to gypsy and traveller plots, please extend existing sites.
181	1	With respect to Elkesley - No.
181	2	The churchyard and surrounding land is not seen as a community asset;
181	3	Elkesley does not have a bowling green or tennis court, but this would be desirable.
181	4	The village public house is up for sale, hopefully as a public house but is not guaranteed.
181	5	The village post office is now defunct and is not guaranteed an alternative will be provided. In conclusion, Elkesley's assets have been severely eroded and as such it is believed the village can not fulfil enough criteria to remain being assessed as a Rural Service Centre, especially with the limited public transport service is considered.
181	6	Site 247 this open area in the heart of the village should be seen as a paramount asset to the village community. This site, used as a village green, incorporating leisure activities such as a bowls green and tennis court would be well received.
181	7	This site is greenfield, outside the village development envelope, a site with potential heritage and archaeological interest. As such it should be a site protected from development and developed as a community asset.
182	1	Sport England therefore supports the site allocations document, particularly the protection of open spaces and the allocation of new open spaces, which are proposed as part of the overall assessment.
182	2	Criterion 8 is supported, however, as a statutory consultee with regard to the protection of playing fields Sport England would suggest that the criterion is expanded to include playing fields and reference to PPG17 (paragraphs 10 and 15) and the Bassetlaw Open Space Study (2010) and Playing pitch Strategy(2010).
182	3	You will also be aware of the Sport England Playing Field Policy 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England' which States; "Sport England will oppose the granting of planning permission for any development which would lead to the loss of, or would prejudice the use of, all or any part of a playing field, or land last used as a playing field or allocated for use as a playing field in an adopted or draft deposit local plan, unless, in the judgement of Sport England, one of the Specific circumstances [Exceptions] applies." E1) A documented assessment of current and future needs has demonstrated that there is an excess of playing fields in the catchment. E2) The proposed development is ancillary to the main use of a site for playing fields. E3) The development affects only land incapable of forming, or forming part of, a playing pitch. E4) The playing fields to be lost would be replaced by a playing field of equivalent or better quality and of equivalent or greater quantity in a suitable location. E5) The proposed development is for a sports facility, the benefit of which would outweigh the harm caused by the loss of a playing field. Reason; Development which would lead to the loss of all or part of a playing field, or which would prejudice its use, should not normally be permitted because it would permanently reduce the opportunities for participation in sporting activities. Government planning policy and the policies of Sport England have recognised the importance of such activities to the social and economic well-being of the country. This policy will be an important consideration regarding the question raised after each section (e.g. Question 6) which deals with the protection of open spaces.
183	1	Broadly speaking, yes, I agree with the criteria
183	2	It is difficult to predict what growth may happen in Retford so I do not want to comment on numbers of houses required but I do believe that there is insufficient industry in the town, having lost several major employers, people are forced to travel to other towns for work. I would like to see greater emphasis placed on the industrial or mixed use site. Attracting employers to Retford is problematic but without the industrial sites serviced and ready to start building work, no employer is going to take this town seriously. If industry is not catered for and housing is allowed to grow the town will become a dormitory town and the central shopping zone will become further weakened. I do however, support the need to direct the main thrust of expanding industrial development in Bassetlaw to the Harworth Bircotes area (just let poor old Retford have a little bit too).
183	3	As stated above, my preference would be for mixed use sites like 51/R7 and 259/R3.
183	4	Same answer as question 10.
183	5	As you are asking
183	6	My understanding is that it is national and local planning policy to try to create housing which is accessible for people working in local industry, there is no industry within walking distance of this site and the SHLAA has many more sites much closer to the existing (and proposed) industrial locations in Retford. The site is obviously greenbelt it has never had previous industrial or housing use and as such development on this land would be in conflict with national and local planning policy. This site (and 37, 512, 7, 46, 309, 6, 69) are filling in the greenbelt between the town of Retford and the villages of Welham/Clarbrough/Hayton, if this is allowed to take place now the reduced gap will become more attractive to developers and in time we will lose more villages as they become absorbed into the town.
183	7	Houses built on this site at the density suggested would certainly overlook properties in both Durham Grove and Palmer Road.
183	8	Durham Grove is inadequate to take any more traffic, the bend in the road is too tight and the visibility round it is very poor, all the residents are aware of this and consequently drive slowly round it. I have had close calls on several occasions where people have been travelling round it too fast (but still less than the speed limit) and we have ended up nose to nose.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
183	9	This land is used as a paddock for the racehorse stables. During this time I have lived here I have seen rabbits, hares, hedgehogs, foxes, pheasant and deer (muntjac and roe). I often see a sparrow hawk working over the paddock. My garden is adjacent to this paddock and I have seen many garden birds including redwings and waxwings. I also get frogs, roads and newts in my garden, I have always assumed they came from the paddock. For a managed landscape this is quite a varied ecological habitat. My neighbour rings and records wild birds and uses his garden for trapping species, I'm sure he could provide a list of birds that use this land. The landscape is at the top of a hill overlooking the villages of Clarborough, Hayton, Clayworth and Gringley.
183	10	Moorgate House is a grade 2 listed farmhouse, the map in Retford library from about the turn of the last century shows a tree lined access track to the house, which passes through the area, designated as site 533. If the setting of the listed building is to be preserved then surely this site forms part of the surroundings in which it is experienced. PPS5 (HE9.1) says substantial harm to or loss of a grade 2 listed building, park or garden should be wholly exceptional. I agree that the harm to the building could not be said to be substantial and that the grounds around Moorgate House are not classed as 'park' (although the carriage drive to this heritage asset can be avoided it should be). I suspect that the Council had insufficient evidence base to include (or exclude) the land around Moorgate House from its Historic Environment Record. Is this site included on the Heritage At Risk Register? Should it be? Why changes what is a current valid use? The owner has never tried to sell this land, in fact he has successfully applied for planning permission to create a horse racing training track on the land.
183	11	The SHLAA for this site talks of using SUDs measures to attenuate storm water flows of the site but the highway drain in Durham Grove is vastly overloaded and the road floods in relatively small rainfall events. Nott's CC as highway authority have asked Bassetlaw DC Engineers (contact Ian Davies) to do something about this flooding but without spending more than NCC can afford (upsizing the drain) nothing can be done. No mention is made of foul drainage in the SHLAA, I believe that it would be impossible to drain foul sewage from the site without an off site sewer. The properties on Durham Grove are served with building drainage type systems to their rear gardens. Site 533 could not gravitate into these systems and would require a pumping station as these drains are very shallow.
183	12	Housing built at this site would have a visual impact on the view of Retford from the villages of Clarborough, Hayton, Clayworth and Gringley and the roads and footpaths that interconnect them.
183	13	I think it is important that the open spaces in all towns are kept and if possible expanded; the open spaces improve the quality of life for all the towns residents.
183	14	My answer to question 14 should mean that I want all open space to remain open but realise that this is impossible, it would be too great a cost to bear for the local residents to maintain these and those that are in private ownership should be allowed to be redeveloped unless the Council had compelling reasons to resist the redevelopment.
183	15	On no account allow the villages to be static, growth is crucial to their survival the whole 10% must be allocated. The type of housing must be affordable for the young people from the village.
183	16	These sites should be spread around the District to keep them small.
183	17	I don't know enough about this subject, do transit and residential travellers want to mix? Do residential pitch sites give the travellers who want to settle the means to do so? Are there any government guidelines.
183	18	I don't know of any
184	1	We agree that limited development of houses should be accepted within Hayton up to a max of 12 properties.
184	2	I think that the development of Corner Farm should be allowed up to the max of 19 houses which would include the 12 mentioned in question 45.
184	3	The following areas should be excluded from the development plan for the following reasons: loss of ecological habitats and landscape, inadequate infrastructure to support the developments, flood risk and traffic generation, access and road safety. Site numbers 161, 160 and 173.
184	4	Any future development should be centred around existing sites. As it would appear that not all of the current capacity has been taken up, which would suggest that there is no proven demand for additional capacity in this area.
185	1	I do not believe the town should be allocated more housing above that what is already required. The proposed figure is manageable and deliverable.
185	2	The sites I would like to be developed are: site 4/w9 option 4, site 39/w10, site 28/w6, site 195/w8 and site 153 and on the main Worksop map sites 35,8,26,371,151,218,561,38,90,30,14,9,60. The reason is some of the sites are next to existing new build and this gives continuity. Other sites may enhance the area, as the land is derelict.
185	3	The sites I would like to be developed are: w12,w1,w13,w6,w8. The reason I give is, they are next to existing industrial sites and again, this gives continuity, ease of access, limit of environmental effect and sense of size for future potential employers who can witness big industrial areas.
185	4	No, other than 39/w10 and 28/w6 for reasons stated above.
185	5	The sites should be protected and new sites acquired. Retford has Kings Park, Retford is half the size of Worksop. Worksop will grow at a faster rate, it should have a park which reflects this. Think big, a huge park would attract people to buy the new houses, which in turn attract large employers.
185	6	Around existing sites, if possible, as this gives a stable environment.
185	7	Provided together, if possible, as this gives maximum benefit for their way of life.
185	8	For a sense of balance - Option A.
186	1	You have asked for responses from the public to the consultation document. I have filled in the on-line questionnaire , and I add the following points with particular reference to the housing proposals made for north east Retford, specifically sites 7,46,309 and 533. I live in Park Lane, and these proposals cause me considerable concern or even alarm.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
186	2	If proposed housing development takes place in these sites, together with sites 37 and 512, a massive increase in traffic along the access roads of Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and Longholme Road is inevitable.
186	3	Even if the maximum allocation of housing is not reached, the congestion, delay and potential danger on these roads, and roads linking to them like Park Lane, The Drive and Palmer Road, would greatly affect the quality of life for all.
186	4	An increase in demand and provision for school places locally would put more traffic , both vehicular and pedestrian, on already busy roads at rush hour times.
186	5	The added and permanent problem of heavy lorry traffic having to be directed along Tiln Lane to avoid the low bridge near Clarborough cannot be disregarded in this analysis.
186	6	Clearly the impact during the building process would be very detrimental, even though I accept that this would be temporary. Nevertheless, add that to the long term effects of urban creep, pressure on fundamental services like drainage, and traffic congestion, and we have a depressing downgrading of the local environment and quality of life.
186	7	A theme of recent developments in Retford - and indeed nationally - is the disruption of local drainage systems by concreting over natural permeable land, and the consequent increase in flood risk. Would not the land in sites 7,46 and 309 be a worrying example of this phenomenon, and a danger in planned housing development in these areas?
186	8	I understand that residents of The Drive have a covenant restricting development on the field in front of their houses, namely site 46. I am suppressed therefore to find that, on the key of the map, site 46 is classified as one where developers, local landowners or others have promoted its potential development. Does this not clash with those covenants, even if some residents waive the restrictions? would it not cause complications and difficulties in progressing the development of this site?
186	9	I think a more radical approach to any developments would work better, namely to not tack on new building to the present boundaries of Retford, but go further out. If we are to use greenfield sites because there are insufficient brownfield sites within Retford, then why not take the opportunity to build where traffic and services would not be congested, and where employment traffic could be more effectively moved to key highways such as the A1 without moving through Retford.
186	10	Methodology ok
186	11	I am not convinced about the additional growth planning, in light of the current projected stagnation in growth locally and nationally.
186	12	I am not happy with the 'tacking on' of new developments to Retford, since most would involve pressure on road networks and other services. If these are deemed greenfield sites, then why not go further out into rural areas?
186	13	I support the protection of open spaces shown and I would add more areas to that, especially around the perimeter of Retford.
186	14	Option A
186	15	The total number of houses to be planned and built is 577 and the advantages of having those on a limited number of mixed sites (i.e. housing alongside employment) are that there can be economies of infrastructure, less travel and more opportunity for the provision of new schools, surgeries and shops, rather than a piecemeal dotting around and using and overloading existing facilities.
186	16	The best locations for such focused sites would be in the southwest and northwest of Retford (sites 259, R2, 51, R7) and some/all of sites 364 and 41. I think they could accommodate all 577 houses alongside industry.
186	17	They would allow access to the major trunk roads around the town, especially the A1, without work time traffic clogging up Retford's roads.
186	18	By contrast, building on the current greenfield sites to the northwest of Retford, sites 46, 309, 7, 6, 533, would present a number of problems that I think make them very undesirable for development.
186	19	Traffic in this area, to work, schools and shops, would massively increase the pressure at key times along key feeder roads on to Tiln Lane and Moorgate, with congestion, delays and danger of accidents.
186	20	The fields in this area are not that well drained - indeed one field in sites 46/309 is still called Pond Field. Concreting and building on them would present and increased flood risk.
186	21	Residents of The Drive have covenants on the field in front of their houses - part of sites 46/309 - preventing building. Your map showing these sites as having the agreement of landowners /developers to build would seem to be contradicted by these covenants.
187	1	Flooding in 2007 was the main problem around our area Cavendish Road, bottom of Grove Coach Road, St Helens Road, also others areas flooding were, Trent Street, Blackstope Lane, Grove Lane.
187	2	High water levels on the 20th January 2008 (please see enclosed photo's) These photos were taken from our upstairs window which shows flooding of the field at the bottom of our garden. This field is on your proposed plan as number 370.
187	3	Bracken Lane schools near capacity and their playing field is flooded many times a year.
187	4	Also with hundreds of vehicles using the estate roads, problems would occur entering London Road, even more so at school times with the extra school traffic.
188	1	We the undersigned residents of Brixworth Way wish to register our strongest objections to the possible development of the land area marked No69 on the Core Strategy Document as proposed by Bassetlaw District Council.
188	2	This plot is the area between (1) Raised Railway Line. (2) Leverton Road. (3) Chesterfield Canal. (4) Welham Road.
188	3	This land is very low lying and after any rain visually waterlogged, it provides a natural habitat for the many animals and birds of which there is an abundance, i.e. Protected Barn Owls. Also Herons, Coots, Moorhens, Kingfishers Sparrow hawks, Curlews, Kestrels, and many other smaller birds. In addition there are the Protected Water Voles. As well as Bats and countless numbers of small mammals.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
188	4	The cost of trying to drain this area would in our opinion be very prohibitive and certainly not cost effective.
188	5	The close presence of the raised section of Railway Line would present major Health and Safety issues as it is not only a Passenger Route, it is very heavily used for the transport of Heavy freight such as Coal and Bulk Liquids. If one of these Freight Trains was derailed one shudders to think of the possible consequences to this area if building took place.
188	6	The only access is via Welham Road, which is already a very busy road and would create additional danger to all traffic.
188	7	This area attracts people from all walks of life, who stroll along the Canal Towpath just to admire the view and the wildlife regardless of the weather, It is one of the very few areas which is in its natural state without any human presence, it is a jewel and should be kept as such for our future generations.
189	1	Option A
189	2	With no buyers for new houses within Elkesley and many houses for sale, some for years, it is hard to see the need for new development
189	3	The above comments apply particularly if 33 houses were to be built! However, if a risk taker is still to build and access direct onto High Street is allowed, I would not be against new development.
189	4	Apart from part of site 247 currently subject to planning application, no other site is suitable without total ruination of Elkesley.
189	5	The current open spaces are of great value and well used. It is vital that the existing short distance path from Headland and Lawnwood Avenue to the children's play area and the football pitch be not lost. Building on area 246 could put this risk
190	1	Yes, I agree with the screening criteria in Retford
190	2	I would not like to see the town allocated more housing.
190	3	I do not wish to see any more housing developed in the future, especially sites 533, 7, 46, 309, 6, 69, 512, 37
190	4	I do not wish to see any more industrial usage - site references 6, 7, 37, 46, 69, 512, 533
190	5	Hallcroft area has the potential to be used as a mixed use site
190	6	The development of sites 533, 7, 46, 309 would be wrong use of prime agricultural land
190	7	These building sites would also encroach over the Retford boundary into the Parish of Claborough, which is not a satisfactory outcome for either the residents of Durham Grove, etc., or the residents of Claborough
190	8	There is no immediate need to extend the Retford boundary. The land is good quality agricultural land and should be used for that purpose only.
190	9	If developers are allowed to build on these sites it will create greater sewage overflow and drainage problems for the existing estates off Tiln Lane
190	10	Further to discussions with various persons via the Council and the planning department, has anyone given the slightest consideration that the village/town of Harworth is crying out for more affordable housing and all Bassetlaw's needs to satisfy the East Midlands Development Board allotments could be solved in one stroke.
190	11	Industrial development, private and public housing are welcome in Harworth so may I suggest that Worksop and Retford together as Bassetlaw, their town planners and Council Members seriously consider Harworth developments instead of Retford.
190	12	Regarding 533. This site is totally unsuitable Durham Grove was built as a cul-de-sac, bungalows suitable for older people.
190	13	The road is very narrow especially the bend in the road. The residents have to be very careful if visitors or delivering vans etc. come in they take the corner wide and at times we have had to brake quickly to avoid them. When visiting they have to park partly in the pavement as if anyone was parking opposite there would be no room to get through.
190	14	Also all this extra traffic would be coming up Tiln Lane, a nightmare, when the school is arriving and leaving. One young boy was knocked down and died a couple of years. It has all the high lorries to Claborough and Gainsborough that have to come that way due to low bridge in Claborough.
190	15	The owner of the land has plenty other land and properties and is wanting to build there for personal gain. He is living in a listed building surrounded by fields so he has no fear of too much traffic like we would. For old people, several disabled, I think this would be very dangerous.
190	16	51/R7 - good access off a main road.
190	17	511, 370 and 3 - good access off a main road.
190	18	27 – good access off a main road.
190	19	3
190	20	51/R7 housing
190	21	3 for employment
191	1	No consultation with residents prior to production of proposal
191	2	The development will alter the character of the area.
191	3	The present road infrastructure is unsuitable for further development
191	4	Loss of good agricultural land
191	5	Additional traffic congestion and danger to pedestrians and road users on Tiln Lane and surrounding roads
191	6	The proposed areas involve building outside the existing development envelope
191	7	The proposal involves building outside the borough boundary

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
191	8	All brownfield sites should be developed for housing before developing the edge of town and beyond the borough boundary
191	9	Very poor drainage systems in place now (very bad problems during the floods of 2007). Extra housing will not improve the system, only make it worse.
191	10	Highway safety. One child already lost outside Carr Hill School.
191	11	Extra traffic congestion during and after the development
191	12	Countryside and trees lost, loss of privacy
191	13	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford
191	14	The existing Highway Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic. HGV's have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school time, leading to safety issues for road users and school children.
191	15	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
191	16	The character of this part of Retford will be changed, for the worse, by the proposed development.
192	1	I am writing to raise my objections to the e-designation of the land north of Retford specifically plots 533, 7, 46 and 309 on your consultation paper.
192	2	To allow this land to be re-designated is criminal when Retford already has an abundance of new builds not selling and a great deal of land already designated for building that has not been utilised
192	3	Any development of this land would totally alter the character of the existing area and impact badly on local wildlife
192	4	The access to these proposed development areas is not suitable for any extra housing let alone the numbers been considered. Tiln Lane in particular is already much too heavily used given it has a large school on it and HGVs using it constantly. To consider allowing even more vehicles such development would mean is ludicrous.
192	5	The land parcel 533 is of particular interest to myself and I can see no sensible way of giving access to this if building was planned as Durham Grove is far from suitable for any more traffic that is currently serves and this is the proposed access.
192	6	Also to allow building of houses would be totally out of keeping with any properties currently on Durham Grove or Palmer Road.
192	7	Also I note the proposals involve building outside the borough boundary and existing development envelope and I can see no reason for this given land is still available within these.
193	1	It is with great concern that we note the considered planning and building areas in Ordsall particularly the areas off Southgate, High Street, and the Meadowlands development. These parcels of land in this area of town are some of the rare agricultural land that can be enjoyed by the general public with the footpaths giving those who appreciate stunning views and access to wildlife such as skylark, gold finches, hares, frogs and toads and partridges.
193	2	This area over recent years has seen a large number of new developments without the benefit of employment, improvement to roads. local amenities, services such as Policing and general thought and consideration to what a larger number of vehicles and wheelie bins can do to an area that is already stretched to capacity.
193	3	The other aspect of the proposed building is that this area suffers from a large amount of anti-social behaviour particularly from the 10 plus age bracket with these young people going through to late teens roaming around the streets abusing property both public and private declaring that they are minors and then disappearing into the rat run of alleyways and thorough fares that are already on the various housing estates again private and social housing.
193	4	The fields should be used for the production of food or green fuel not more houses that are going to create social problems that the area will never recover from. The Retford and Ordsall area is awash with tall new houses that cannot accommodate the vehicles that go with the residents and the wheelie bins that constantly blight our streets. There is also a huge decline in the potential sale of second hand properties due to the blight of new build and the incentives offered by Developers to move their properties part exchanges only if moving up and mortgage packages unavailable for the general consumer.
193	5	The area of Ordsall in particular requires employment to fill the already empty commercial sites and buildings. it requires something to occupy the young people who once out of school, if they have bothered to attend in the first place somewhere to stimulate and entertain themselves as it now seems that the young are unable to occupy themselves without causing grief, concern and distress to the general public. We regularly experience anti social behaviour of lets rampage down the street pulling over the bins, or empty waste bins by bus stops or run over gardens and borders, knocking on elderly residents doors and running away, or crashing through borders with bikes and balls does Ordsall and the residents need more of the same?
193	6	There would be no point at all in blighting a wonderful landscape enjoyed by ramblers and residents alike when you would only be putting an already overstretched, under resourced area to breaking point. The young and those with criminal intent have enough areas to hide, run and abuse in this area without creating further havens for them. Please for once take into consideration the roads and services cannot take any more. The health issues not only from the cars but noise levels from the Gamston airport already spoilt and detracted from the area. There are so many other important issues that should be looked at first before building any more houses. The health issues also arise from providing a complete hospital service under one easily accessible roof instead of farming upset and ill patients and family members out to another town without real thought of how the patients and family are going to get them there or visit them. We are told that the health service in this area is already at breaking point yet you are considering more houses. As we write this letter we have recently experienced the stress and strain of a sick relative having to go into Doncaster Royal Infirmary only to be then turned away and then readmitted into a day room to start treatment until a bed could be found. There was no family transport or thought or consideration as to how this patient was to get to Doncaster. Whilst in hospital wards were being rapidly shut due to the Norovirus do you factor all of the social requirements into your thought process when you reach your decisions? Not only does this apply to health but also to the Police Force which is almost non-existent in this area much to the delight of the young and those with criminal intent.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
193	7	This town has already wasted 1.5 million pounds on the revamping of the market square which if it was going to be of any value to the town should have been free short term parking bringing people into the centre of town allowing access to all areas. The market should be integrated with the shopping areas giving a complete shopping experience which was enjoyed when the work took place on the square. There should be incentives for smaller retail outlets to survive offering a different shopping experience from a High Street that is filled with more of the same. The greater good of areas like Retford and Ordsall are forfeit for the profit of a few without thought or consequence of the social requirements needed for these areas to survive and to work in a harmonious manner. A further thought would be to have a permanent indoor market inside one of the larger empty retail outlets allowing potential new small businesses a chance to start up as a new enterprise.
193	8	
193	9	In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
193	10	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows
193	11	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road I Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times.
193	12	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A 1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses
193	13	Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside
193	14	The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path) Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees. + a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
193	15	The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathletes etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
193	16	For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
194	1	I don't believe Retford will have the infrastructure -in particular employment opportunity and schooling -to support the amount of housing development already identified as 'required.' I certainly don't think any increase should be made.
194	2	It makes more sense to me that potential sites nearest the town's centre are prioritised for development; namely sites 10, 70, 71 & 342. Following these locations, 488, 489, 69, 6, & 3 would have better proximity & access to the town centre than the sites further afield.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
194	3	Site 51 is better suited to employment developments than the other locations because of proximity to existing businesses & good main road access to primary national routes such as the A 1 which avoid the town centre.
194	4	I would hope it goes without saying that King's Park is one of Retford's greatest assets and should be protected at any cost. Besides the park, the other open spaces identified are a valuable component of the town's quality and would also benefit from protection.
194	5	However I'm concerned that the density of networked open space seems somewhat lower in the existing developments in the South West of Retford and that further development there would follow that model.
194	6	I'm also concerned that the town appears to be situated within a band of grade 2 agricultural land -which is strongly contraindicated for development. Nevertheless, most of the sites & by far most of the area being considered for building is in these high quality greenfield locations.
195	1	No I do not wish to see the boundaries extended the envelope should be left as it is.
195	2	No, unless employment opportunities become available and the infrastructure becomes to sustain these developments, As at time many new developments are empty.
195	3	Harworth desperately needs development of houses and industrial units and have asked for it.
195	4	In Retford development with better access is major road structure not prime agricultural land.
195	5	Hallcroft area with better infrastructure in place.
195	6	Again Hallcroft, Ordsall with better facilities
195	7	Durham Grove is one of the quieter cul-de-sacs in the north area of Retford where senior citizens, can live peacefully and safely.
195	8	The north needs some agricultural sites and open spaces which are safe for the inhabitants to enjoy.
195	9	Definitely not.
195	10	Harworth.
195	11	In my opinion (living on Durham Grove), the cul-de-sac has a narrow road, just adequate to cope with present number of occupancy. Is to cope with present number of occupancy is in vicinity of a school (with parking problems now). Heavy traffic on Tiln Lane. Access very difficult at peak times.
196	1	Screening criteria are fine
196	2	Agree
196	3	228-western end, 483, 231 (in order)
196	4	Site 230 should be further developed as a sports field.
196	5	The open space marked 38/1 is a bit obscure. Maybe some other open spaces should be identified.
196	6	At existing sites so that proper facilities can be provided at most efficient cost
196	7	Not able to answer, without more information about rules of experience. Certainly transit sites must remain transit.
196	8	No suggestions
197	1	I would like to object to the proposal to build houses in the fields near Bigsby Road.
197	2	As far as I am aware there has been no consultation with the residents, and the character of the area is bound to be changed not for the good
197	3	I thought all brownfield sites had to be developed for housing before group outside the boundary
197	4	I trust there will be an improvement to the junction at the end of Tiln Lane where it meets the road to Gainsborough as the extra traffic will cause a lot of congestion.
198	1	I have been resident at the above address for several years and feel I must write to demonstrate my opposition to the planned development of good agricultural land as outlined in your plans for future house building on plots outlined in your planning document identified as plots 533,512, 309, 154,77,70,46, 37 and 7.
198	2	All Brownfield sites should be developed for housing before developing the edge of town and beyond the borough boundary
198	3	The loss of good agricultural land.
198	4	The proposal involves building outside the current borough boundary
198	5	Additional traffic congestion and danger to pedestrians and road users on Tiln lane and surrounding roads
198	6	The development would change the character of the area.
198	7	The present road infrastructure is unsuitable for further development.
199	1	I think Blyth could have 20 new houses without importantly too much on the area
199	2	266 with possibly some of 214
199	3	No.
199	4	The open spaces as identified on the map should be retained
200	1	In all recent building development in our area little or no consideration has been given to infrastructure or environmental issues with the result that: A) the town is saturated with traffic especially in the Ordsall and Welham 1 districts, and
200	2	B) air, living and green space quality has greatly deteriorated over the last 5 to 10 years. HAS ANY RESEARCH BEEN DONE ON THESE ISSUES???

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
200	3	Therefore, assuming the government and local councils are serious about these issues as compared to the demands of 'big business', any new development should give priority to these aspects.
200	4	With this in mind it should be obvious that the Ordsall and Welham areas are the WORST places for such building since the roads,(Ordsall High Street and 5 Arches Bridge, West Hill Road, Ollerton Road, Eaton Village Road, Welham Road, Tiln Lane etc. simply cannot cope with more traffic. Further, any road development would be extremely difficult and costly. They are already dangerous traffic and crossing areas with schools, senior citizens bungalows, churches and care homes. This apart from the obvious increased environmental pollution.
200	5	The two districts where major roads already exist and infrastructure (g development would be easiest is on the North Road and the Grove Road areas where there is easier access and egress to and from the town.
200	6	Yes, new business and employment is important for Retford but that will not be made easier by destroying the nature of the town and district. by 'crowding out' and eventually making our town and area LESS attractive to prospective residents and business.
200	7	Finally, who are going to buy these houses? Very little affordable housing for first time buyers has been built in the last few years.
200	8	What about all the empty sites and 'brown' sites in the town??
200	9	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
200	10	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
200	11	There will be a significant loss of amenity
200	12	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
200	13	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
200	14	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
201	1	I have been resident at the above address for several years and feel I must write to demonstrate my opposition to the planned development of good agricultural land as outlined in your plans for future house building on plots outlined in your planning document identified as plots 533, 512, 309, 154, 77, 70,46, 37 and 7
201	2	All Brownfield sites should be developed for housing before developing the edge of town and beyond the borough boundary
201	3	The loss of good agricultural land
201	4	The proposal involves building outside the current borough boundary
201	5	Additional traffic congestion and danger to pedestrians and road users on Tiln lane and surrounding roads
201	6	The development would change the character of the area
201	7	The present road infrastructure is unsuitable for further development
201	8	The proposal involves building outside the existing development envelope
202	1	I would like to hereby object to the proposed development of over 1000 new houses to be built in the area north of Badgers Close and the surrounding areas around Bigsby Road and Palmer Road, often Lane in Retford.
202	2	The reasons for my objection are that this will lead to an increase in traffic using Tiln Lane and the surrounding roads, which will compromise road safety for pedestrians, including school children who attend the adjacent Carr Hill primary school. Also the present road infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the increasing number of heavy goods vehicles and normal traffic using Tiln Lane let alone a further increase due to the planned development
202	3	I am aware that for over 30 years the council have been considering plans to build a by-pass road which directs heavy goods vehicles around the low bridge, which circumnavigates Claborough and prevents similar vehicles from having to use Tiln Lane. Surely if the council believed that a by-pass was required 30 years ago it is definitely required now as during the last 30 years traffic, especially heavy goods vehicles, has increased substantially
202	4	Before the council should even consider building any new houses it should find the money to build the long overdue by-pass as my above concerns regarding the infrastructure and road safety will become real. Accidents will happen, adults and children will be put at increased risk and the damage to the road surface and structure will mean increased maintenance costs that the council could do without
203	1	I'm writing in support of the above 2 developments, but with a certain reservations and recommendations with regard to conditions, which we suggest need to be imposed.
203	2	We support the building of affordable housing in the town of Retford, but would prefer the development of brown field sites before the use of good agricultural land which is outside of the boundary of the existing development envelope. There are many pockets of land in the town which could do with modernisation, particularly over shops, warehouses and deserted public houses
203	3	We feel that the building of these houses will create employment in the area, and providing it is used to attract people from outside of the area, it will also help bring purchasing power into the town centre. If it is used merely shift people from old terraced houses, which are then not redeveloped, it is a counter-productive move.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
203	4	Our main objection to the site of both proposed developments is that they have extremely poor road access. The old Gainsborough road, which is currently being used by through commuter traffic and heavy goods vehicles, is really only of a sufficient standard to cope with existing traffic. Even with one car families. These new developments would generate over 1000 extra vehicles going down Tin Lane. With more than one car per household, the generation of traffic down Tiln Lane in the peak hours of the day will Visibly lead to the need to install traffic lights at the brow of the hill of the A 620, where Tiln lane enters it. Otherwise, it is suggested traffic will be disabled from entering into the main road and there is the potential for serious accidents on the hill where the sight line is not particularly good anyway. It is suggested that even for building-site vehicles, the installation of a traffic light at this point prior to building will be essential.
203	5	Tiln Lane also has a Primary school upon it. This faces directly onto the road and many parents stop in the vicinity. A zebra crossing and beacon light will be needed to enable parents and children to walk across the road in safety to the large number of homes on the other side, when traffic flow increases.
203	6	Tiln Lane has no direct access into Botham Lane, which would give another exit onto the A 620. It is highly unlikely that people will use the exit onto the A620, because the sight lines, from a minor estate road onto it, are very bad and there is no sweep of the bend to enable traffic to merge into fast moving traffic on this main road
203	7	There is every likelihood that the occupants of the 900 houses north of Durham Grove would try to access Tiln Lane by using Bigsby Road. The occupants of all side roads off Tin Lane could well be prevented from entering into Bigsby Road in order to reach Tiln Lane, unless there is traffic calming on Bigsby Road and stop signs upon it to enable those in side roads to have the right of way
203	8	With the building of such a big estate, conditions should be placed upon any developers. It is suggested that there should be within the heart of the 900 estate a small shopping complex, with rented takeaway opportunities. This would help to reduce traffic from the estate for short journeys to access a supermarket for, say, bread and milk. Also in this area, there should be provided recycling facilities, particularly for tins and glass, because the town disposal area is a considerable way from the proposed site. It should also be a condition that a playground for the younger children and an adventure framework area, together with a cycle track, should be provided for late juniors and early teens. This area could also do with a meeting room for family events and for older people and mothers with toddlers to meet. I suggest that if there is insufficient finance to enable these road access considerations and general considerations to be dealt with within the planning process, the proposals should not go ahead.
204	1	I am alarmed to hear that there is a proposal to identify land in the Tiln Lane area north of Badgers Chase, Durham Grove, Palmer Road, Bigsby Road and Park Lane as potential sites that could be allocated for future housing developments. I refer to site allocation numbers 46,309,7, 533,6,512,37, and 69
204	2	I fail to see the sense in spoiling the beautiful countryside in this area and using up agricultural land, especially when there are large areas of land within the boundary of Retford such as the old school sites that can be developed.
204	3	At the moment the area is a pleasant and relatively peaceful place in which to live. I fear that a development of this size will destroy the quality of life currently enjoyed by residents.
204	4	Tiln Lane is quite a narrow road and I think that the increased volume of traffic would cause considerable congestion and be a hazard to pedestrians, particularly to children attending Carr Hill School
204	5	Furthermore most people, who commute to work from Retford, will exit the town from the other side to access the large towns and cities where work can be obtained (Sheffield, Nottingham, Mansfield, Doncaster etc.). So situating a development in the Tiln Lane area would cause congestion in the centre of Retford which is already a nightmare at rush-hour times.
205	1	Site 256 poses great access problem: top of Limes Avenue being on bends and narrow. There is already traffic flow problems along Portland Terrace and planned infill on old club side will add to this. Even though this all over the border in Bolsover DC, still a problem for Nether Langwith residents
205	2	Still 252 would seem least objectionable if there has to be new housing. The historic Fairfield should be left green
205	3	Open spaces identified should be protected
205	4	Nether Langwith is a well balanced community and should be left so
206	1	Option A
206	2	Yes
206	3	Any of the sites but only allowing 2 or 3 houses per site because of the access problems.
206	4	Will potential residents want to move into a village with a threat of a proposed wind farm development
207	1	I'm writing to object to the proposed new developments in the above areas over the next few years. We moved to Bigsby Road 10 years ago because it was a tranquil area of Retford and close to the country side where we walk our dogs daily. If the new development proposals get approval it will alter the character of the area turning the country side around our property into another housing jungle.
207	2	The developments will increase traffic congestion and increase danger to road users and pedestrians. 600 new houses will increase daily traffic movement by 2400 times per day over and above the current amount and the current road infrastructure is unsuitable for this increase in traffic movement.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
207	3	Why can't exist brown field sites be developed for housing before extending into green field sites which are at the edge of town and beyond the borough boundary
207	4	The areas are currently good agricultural land that will be lost with these developments.
207	5	I object strongly to these new development proposals and urge you our council who should be working on behalf on the community to reconsider these proposals
208	1	We write to you regarding the above reference. We feel we must strongly object to such a drastic redevelopment of the area in which we live for the following reasons.
208	2	My wife and I have been residents and local business owners over the last 23 years, although i was born and raised here. We recently purchased our property in Durham Grove for various reasons, but mainly because of its privacy and peaceful outlook something to look forward to in our retirement.
208	3	We would have expected to have been consulted as residents prior to the production of the proposal something that never happened
208	4	A development on this scale would completely alter the character and charm of the area taking it from a peaceful and pleasant place to live to nothing less than congested traffic filled disaster
208	5	Our current road infrastructure could not cope with the level of traffic that this development would add. Tiln Lane is already a busy road with it being a route for articulated Lorries and a very busy primary school situated there. Traffic is in my opinion currently an issue with vehicles speeding up and down the road at busy peak times causing danger to school children and pedestrians alike. The scale proposed would cause nothing but danger congestion and strain on the surrounding roads as well as them being used as returns and cut-thought's.
208	6	This would also involve building outside of the existing development envelope as well as outside the borough boundary causing a loss of good agricultural land. It can only suggest that all brownfield sites should be developed for housing first before a development of this nature and scale be even considered.
208	7	In addition to this it would impact on our community, neighbours and friends causing the loss natural light into our properties, most of us would be overshadowed. Excess noise and disruption would be added with all the extra traffic up and down the roads, it would be like living in the middle of the busy town centre. Adding to these trees would be cut down and lost and this can never be a positive thing.
208	8	I hope our objections are taken very seriously as we feel no good can come from the proposed development
209	1	Yes
209	2	Option A, Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
209	3	Yes, I agree that at least 14 new homes should be built, but would support more if we could have some more village facilities.
209	4	Site 228 would be the best site for housing
209	5	The village would like some tennis courts and a bowling green
209	6	The New Play area on site 230 should be protected
210	1	Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
210	2	Hayton and Clarbrough are capable of absorbing 12 more houses
210	3	No, the comment in Q45 is with an acceptance that some development is likely to go ahead at Corner Farm
210	4	Site 544 and 545 if Hayton is selected for development
210	5	No
210	6	I am strongly in favour of the open space designated in Hayton being retained as such
210	7	Such sites should be concentrated around existing sites. Presumably providing new/additional facilities on existing sites will be more cost effective than a new site development. Some of the anti social behaviour often associated with these sites should not be spread further than necessary.
211	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?.
211	2	No further development in Sutton is required. This should be allocated to the towns rather than the villages.
211	3	None
211	4	No further development is wanted in Sutton
211	5	Yes, No further development is wanted in Sutton
211	6	We already have a half empty site at Daneshill
211	7	REMOVED
212	1	Yes
212	2	Option A. Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
212	3	Yes, I agree. However, I think there should be more than 14 over an 18 period. I think up to 30 new homes would not harm the village character.
212	4	294 and 468
212	5	Sites near the school do flood
212	6	All protected spaces should be protected
212	7	No
212	8	No

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
212	9	N/A
213	1	Yes, we agree with the methodology
213	2	Option A, Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes.
213	3	Yes, although we would support more, if there were to be some affordable housing for young and older people.
213	4	Sites 165 and 164 would make sensible extension to the village
213	5	Sites close to Main Street flood
213	6	The village play area should be kept and protected
213	7	Existing Sites
213	8	Together
213	9	None
214	1	No, I do not agree, the villages do not have the infrastructure to support any more dwellings
214	2	Option B focused in just one town
214	3	No, I do not agree, the villages do not have the infrastructure to support any more dwellings
214	4	No, my view would not change as I have already stated, the villages do not have the infrastructure to support any more dwellings
214	5	If any, only the Broadgores development
214	6	Its about time that the Clarborough bypass was built
214	7	There should not be any new sites
214	8	They should not be provided at all
214	9	Worksop Queens buildings Car Park
215	1	Option B. Focused in just one of the above towns
215	2	I think hat it should be more, Clarborough has become a stagnant village and we need growth an new people.
215	3	No, the village needs growth and prosperity
215	4	I do not know the ref no's but the land between Broadgores and Smeath Lane needs development.
216	1	Option A. Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
216	2	I do not agree to any allocations of land for development in Clarborough or Hayton until a bypass for the two villages has been constructed, diverting traffic to the A620. This is a very busy road, with much heavy traffic, crossed by school children of various ages, it is already a big safety concern and would only be exacerbated by building of more housing
216	3	No, it would only be reinforced
216	4	See answer to Q45
216	5	Yes
216	6	Around existing sites as facilities are already in place so extending would provide the most cost effective solution.
216	7	Together reason as per q121
217	1	No more effort should be made to simplify the terminology of methodology or is that a deliberate ploy?
217	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
217	3	I do not agree. Future costs to improve the infrastructure to accommodate any proposals to increase the numbers already outlined I.e. 19 houses at corner farm. This site alone will require changes to the junction of corner farm. Even then consideration should be made regarding any increase in traffic movements will create congestion and a the greater possibility of accidents, the use of Smeath Lane as an A road is at present already unsatisfactory (where HGV use the junction and find it difficult to pass each other as there are no footpaths further down the road, also the route passes a junior school). Increased traffic flow will not improve the situation
217	4	No my opinion will not change. The local primary school is already full to capacity (the students taking lessons in the corridor). Where will the council get the money from to extend the school and to improve the infrastructure? Or will they give permission for building and then fail to improve roads and drains (Hay ton already has been promised drain improvements in the past but nothing has been done so far by the council).
217	5	None. As we have no amenities. No post office. Problem with drains, certain areas are prone to flooding and problem road layouts.
217	6	Yes open spaces should be protected
217	7	The representative from Bassetlaw Council stated during the question and answer in Clarborough village hall that Gypsy and Traveller numbers were going down -therefore it would appear new sites should not be needed.
217	8	If current sites are extended, then all amenities are already available. Surely the council does not have the funds to waste on sites that are not needed.
218	1	Yes

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
218	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
218	3	Yes, i would not object to more.
218	4	164 and 165.
218	5	Flooding and drainage issues along main street.
218	6	Yes, these should be protected
219	1	We would like to voice our objections about the proposed plans to join both ends of Broad gores approximately 90 homes on the land in-between. The sewers struggle tremendously with the houses already there. We have to use drain rods every month just to keep things flowing smoothly. This obviously shows the sewers are not large enough to cope. e local school is full at present and has a long waiting list.
219	2	The school itself is in a poor position in the village and the parking is very difficult and also troublesome for the residents of hill view crescent. More houses more children hence more traffic.
219	3	The village has had traffic problems for many years and with the increase in housing, no local amenities and no space ~in the local school will in turn increase the traffic and the dangers this possesses.
219	4	The proposed building plan itself would create a high volume of lorries and machinery and if the two ends of broadgores were to be joined together this would turn a quiet and safe cul-de-sac into through road.
219	5	At present children on the cul-de-sac are safe to ride their bikes and play with their friends without the fear of getting run over!
219	6	Also the noise pollution this would create is a major concern. I am not the only resident who works shifts, and if the proposed plans were passed this would have a major impact on our lives
219	7	In winter the roads around the village are not gritted. The main A620 was gritted but this left Big Lane barely usable for about 4 weeks in 2010. I dread to think what more traffic onto an already dangerous road is going to do, as most of the houses in Big Lane do not have large front gardens, if a lorry was to slide where do you think it would end up
219	8	The bus service is poor, we have no shop, post office, medical facilities, so again a car would be necessary for most families to access these facilities in Retford. Older children that have to use the bus service to get to the Comprehensive schools in Retford, this will increase the passenger numbers on these buses which are already congested due to the limited services already in place!
219	9	When we bought our house and moved to a quiet village we paid more for that privilege and by allowing the proposed building plans to go through I know for a fact it will severely de-value our home and the value of everyone else on Broadgores, so I do not believe that the proposals has been thought through thoroughly enough or other locations looked at in detail.
219	10	I hope and pray that Bassetlaw District Council look more closely at the effects that this will have on the community of Clarborough and listen to what we have to say. We will not sit back and watch you to ruin our beautiful village just to line the pockets of some greedy building contractor! After living in this area for over 30 years I KNOW there are lots of areas which would be more suited for this kind of building proposal, and I Implore you to rethink your plans.
220	1	I have seen the plan published by the Trader & Guardian on 17th November and would like to comment on the areas marked as Potential Housing that border Bracken Lane and those that border the footpath that links Five Fields Lane with Grove Road
220	2	At least some of these sites have been the subject of planning applications in recent years and all have been rejected, as far as I am aware, because of the increased risk of flooding at these and neighbouring sites, including Grove Lane in particular.
220	3	During the floods of July 2007, I think it was, the drainage channel that runs under Bracken Lane beside NO.50 was feeding water onto the road through the pipe that runs from the gutter outside No. 48. The water level was only about an inch below the front doors. The level was only prevented from rising by the water flowing onto, and flooding, the fields bordering Bracken Lane.
220	4	In conclusion, I feel that any development that increases the rate at which rain water enters the (natural) drainage channel from the east of Grove Road, under Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane, to Grove Lane is to be strongly opposed.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
221	1	Our Client has some concerns in relation to the Site Assessment Criteria that is to be used in identifying sites for the preferred options stage under Stage Two of the Site Allocations Screening Methodology Section. The first of these concerns relates to Criterion 1, which asks whether or the local community is supportive of the development of the site.
221	2	Council's economic objectives. This criterion appears to suggest that the development of any site for housing would not lead to the delivery of economic development opportunities. Whilst our Client agrees that housing in itself is not defined as 'economic development' under Planning Policy Statement 4: 'Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth' (PPS4), it should be recognised that housing is often needed to support the delivery of economic development elsewhere.
221	3	Our Client disagrees with the scoring outcomes in relation to Groundwater Source Protection Zones (SPZs) . Paragraph 2.35 of the SAIO states that: "It is important to note that housing and employment development do not present equal potential for pollution of ground water, as housing is not generally considered by the Environment Agency as a polluting activity, whereas some employment uses ... present a higher risk. To reflect this, the proposed use of a site will also inform how it is assessed against this criterion," Whilst this paragraph recognises that housing is not viewed as a polluting activity and that the proposed use of a site will be taken into consideration in the scoring of a site under this criterion, the grades shown do not reflect this and merely seek to score sites depending on the SPZ they fall within. Our Client recommends that the grading system is altered to recognise the type of development proposed as follows:
221	4	Our Client notes that this criterion draws heavily on the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (BLCA) of August 2009. It is considered that the scoring system is too simplistic when compared with the content of the BLCA. The scoring system is based on which Landscape Character Zone (LCZ) sites fall within, with sites in a 'create' LCZ scoring 'green', those in a 'restore or reinforce' LCZ scoring 'amber' and those in a 'conserve' LCZ scoring 'red'. Our Client notes that there are many more LCZs defined in the BLCA. How does the Council propose to deal with sites that are within the 'conserve and create' LCZ for example? 2.12 In addition, the scoring system does not take account of the capacity of sites to accommodate development, taking into account such factors as tree cover and topography. Again, the nuances of each site should determine the score in relation to this criterion than blind reliance on the BLCA. Furthermore, the BLCA notes that in the 'conserve' LCZ for example, landscape actions should "encourage the conservation of distinctive features and features in good condition" but does not specifically prevent development from occurring in these areas. Our Client considers that factors such as these should be taken into consideration in the scoring of sites in relation to this criterion.
221	5	577 dwellings. Our Client believes that the residual requirement for Retford is higher than the is as the number of deliverable dwellings from sites with planning permission has been overestimated. In particular, three sites with planning permission have been incorrectly included in the Council's supply of housing in Retford. These applications are as detailed in Table 2.1 below
221	6	Our Client also notes that sites 65 and 66 lie within Flood Zone 2. Given the need to direct development towards areas of the lowest flood risk (i.e. Flood Zone 1 sites) under the tests set out in Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk (PPS25), it is questionable whether these sites could be brought forward in the short term and therefore be classed as deliverable under the tests of paragraph 54 of PPS3 (see Section 3.0 of this Report for details).
221	7	Our Client notes that there is an allocated site included within the Council's deliverable supply of housing (Ref: 77) for 226 dwellings. This site was also referred to as Site H49 (River Idle Corridor) in the Local Plan. We note that an outline application has now been submitted which is currently being determined. The description refers to "up to 226 dwellings", however the planning supporting statement states "up to" 178 dwellings. This means there is a potential shortfall of at least 48 dwellings.
221	8	Taking the above into account, the total deliverable housing supply for Retford should be reduced by 147 dwellings (99 from the lapsed/refused permissions and 48 from Site BAS0077). On this basis, our Client believes that the residual housing requirement for Retford should be 724 dwellings in total (577 plus 147 reduction in existing supply).
221	9	Whilst our Client is happy with the overall level of housing proposed to be accommodated in Retford, there are concerns in relation to the calculation of the residual housing requirement in Retford (see paragraphs 2.13 to 2.17 inclusive above), such that there is a need to identify more land for housing through the Site Allocations DPD than is currently being proposed

Reference number		Answer
Response number	Comment	
221	10	This Site is detached from the settlement of Retford and would thus rely on Site 52 to be developed first in order to avoid sporadic development in the countryside (please see detailed comments on Site 52 at paragraphs 3,16 to 3,17 below), In addition, Site 1 is reliant on Site 52 as access is problematic from Ollerton Road, such that access would need to be either through Site 52 or improved by means of off-site highways works delivered through a S278 Agreement.
221	11	Given the size of Sites 1, 40 and 52, the proposed timescales for their development as set out in the SHLAA and the current state of the market, our Client considers that it is unlikely that Site 1 will be developed within the plan period, Therefore at present, Site 1 cannot be considered to be deliverable under the tests set out at paragraph 54 of PPS3 as it is not suitable nor available
221	12	4 Notwithstanding the above, we note that there are a number of constraints associated with the site that have the potential to affect the dwelling capacity of the site, These include: Flood Zones 2 and 3 in the east of the site; An area of archaeological interest in the central third of the site; and The need to provide appropriate infrastructure (roads and public open space) as part of any development.
221	13	It is noted that the nature and extent of the area of archaeological interest has not been defined in the SHLAA, Whilst public open space could be provided in this area, our Client feels that the SHLAA has not taken adequate account of the flood risk areas or the quantum of roads that would be required to access what is a large site, Given these constraints, we would suggest that approximately 70% of the full site area (9.7ha) is developable (6,79ha), which would yield approximately 204 dwellings, rather than the 233 suggested in the SHLAA, 3,6 For the reasons set out above, our Client does not believe that Site 1 is suitable for housing development at the present time and should not therefore be pursued as a potential housing site in the Site Allocations DPD, Site 3 -London Road
221	14	Our Client believes that Site 3 is not suitable for development due to the access constraints associated with it. The SHLAA rightly notes that visibility is problematic due to the hump of the bridge, We also note that the level change from the road to the site could pose problems in achieving the requisite visibility splays
221	15	The SHLAA also notes that "a number of access points suggest good phasing opportunities through a consortium of builders when the market picks up": It is not clear what access points are being referred to here, however we note that the only other potential access would be from Grove Coach Road, through Site 370 (please refer to our comments on Site 370 below), Grove Coach Road is a single-track lane and is inadequate to support housing development of any scale at present. Furthermore, our Client notes that a 'consortium of builders' that could overcome these issues is by no means guaranteed
221	16	The SHLAA also notes that "a number of access points suggest good phasing opportunities through a consortium of builders when the market picks up": It is not clear what access points are being referred to here, however we note that the only other potential access would be from Grove Coach Road, through Site 370 (please refer to our comments on Site 370 below), Grove Coach Road is a single-track lane and is inadequate to support housing development of any scale at present. Furthermore, our Client notes that a 'consortium of builders' that could overcome these issues is by no means guaranteed
221	17	the west of the site. Has any provision been made for their relocation? Furthermore, the loss of the nurseries would result in a loss of jobs in this part of Retford
221	18	The site is also within a Conservation Area, which would restrict the capacity of the site in any event, due to the need to retain trees and preserve views to Grove Park through low density development. Our Client therefore believes that a capacity of 267 dwellings (based on 30 dwellings per hectare) is too high and suggests that approximately 178 dwellings (based on 20 dwellings per hectare on 70% of the gross site area) would be more appropriate, should the site be allocated for development. Notwithstanding our comments on capacity above, our Client believes that the access constraints are too severe for this site, such that it should not be allocated for housing development through the Site Allocations DPD. Site 40 -Southfield
221	19	Site 40 is also reliant on the development of Site 52 for access, such that it would be developed after that site, if it were to be allocated. The site also falls partly within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and would also need to provide internal roads and public open space, such that site capacity is affected. It is noted that the SHLAA bases the site capacity on 90% of the gross site area. However, our Client believes that 75% of the gross site area is more appropriate, given the constraints noted above. On this basis, we believe that a site capacity of 119 dwellings is more realistic than 143.
221	20	In addition, our Client disagrees that the Site could be completed within 3 years of its allocation. Due to the access constraint, it is unlikely that this site will be developed before Site 52, which itself is noted as being developable in 6-10 years. Furthermore, there are lead-in times to consider in obtaining planning permission and discharging conditions, which for a large site such as this can take many months, even years before work commences on site. Therefore it is unlikely that houses will begin to be delivered on this site before 10 years after the adoption of the Site Allocations DPD, should this site be allocated.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
221	21	This site is subject to significant constraints that will affect the potential capacity of the site: namely an area of archaeological interest in the north western corner and high voltage power lines that cross the site. Not only will the power lines affect capacity, they are also likely to impact upon the viability of developing the site due to the costs associated with relocating the 11kV and 33kV pylons underground
221	22	As a result, our Client believes that the suggested capacity of 166 dwellings, based upon 80% net developable area is too high when taking all requirements; including clearance zones to the pylons, internal road layout and public open space into account. Our Client suggests that 70% net developable area is more realistic, which yields a dwelling capacity of 145 dwellings based on 30 dwellings per hectare.
221	23	This site is considered to be suitable for development in the SHLAA. Whilst our Client would tend to agree with the principle of development here, it is also noted that this site is crucial to the development of sites 1 and 40 as explained above. Our Client notes that access is proposed to be taken from Lansdown Drive, which has stubs at its eastern end to allow for access into Site 52. Whilst this access may be appropriate for the development of Site 52, our Clients doubt that Lansdown Drive (a residential street) is capable of serving Sites 1 and 40 as well. It is therefore maintained that Sites 1 and 40 should not be allocated for development in the Site Allocations DPD.
221	24	In addition, our Client believes that the site capacity is marginally too high, being based upon a net developable area of 80%. 75% net developable area is a more widely used figure when calculating site capacity of large sites such as this, such that the site capacity is more likely to be approximately 222 dwellings, should it be considered appropriate to allocate this site.
221	25	It is noted that a significant proportion of this site falls into Flood Zone 2, such that a sequential test would be required to demonstrate that it is sequentially preferable. Our Client believes that there are sequentially preferable sites available that are capable of accommodating Retford's housing requirement (including their site at Tiln Lane -Site 37), such that this site should not be allocated for housing development . /
221	26	Our Client also notes that access to the site would need to be taken from Welham Road (the A620) where highways improvements may be required to accommodate the development of the site. The costs associated with highways improvements on a busy road, such as Welham Road, could be prohibitive to development
221	27	Even if the site were to be allocated for development, our Client suggests that the flood risk issue will limit capacity of the site to around 75% of the gross site area, such that the maximum capacity @ of this site is approximately 95 dwellings (30 dwellings per hectare on 3.17ha).
221	28	21 This site is significantly constrained by the proposed access from Grove Coach Road, which is narrow and therefore unsuitable as a means of access to Site 370. Considerable improvements would be needed to Grove Coach Road in order to bring it up to an acceptable standard and this is likely to be costly.
221	29	The development of this site is required in order to facilitate the development of Site 3, which would significantly add to the need to improve Grove Coach Road. Our Client considers that it is unlikely that Grove Coach Road could be improved to enable Site 3 to be developed such that we maintain that Site 3 should not be allocated through the Site Allocations DPD
221	30	The development of this site is also constrained by access considerations. The SHLAA notes that improvements would be needed to Bracken Way to enable development of the site. It is noted that Bracken Way is narrow, with development on just one side at present to the west of the site
221	31	There is also a bridge over a brook in the north-western corner, which could prove difficult to widen to allow development here, given the location of existing properties. Alternatively, access could be provided from Grove Coach Road, but this too is constrained as noted in relation to Sites 3 and 370 above.
221	32	Our Client's land at Tiln Lane, Retford is identified as Site 37 in the SAIO. The maximum potential capacity listed for this site on Figure 5.1 of the SAIO is 154 dwellings. You may recall that a Planning and Concept Masterplan Report (June 2011) has already been submitted to the Council to demonstrate the development potential of this site. This Report, which showed a reduced site area than that currently identified in the Site under Site 37, demonstrated a site capacity of approximately 200 dwellings. Our Client considers therefore that Site 37 could accommodate more than 200 dwellings. In addition, Site 512, which would 'square off' development in this area could also be allocated as a future phase of housing development, thereby increasing the dwelling capacity further. 4.3 The remainder of this section of the Report provides an assessment of the sustainability and delivery of Site 37. The site is located approximately 1 mile to the north of Retford town centre and is therefore within walking distance (20 minutes) of the facilities located there. In addition, the site is located in close proximity to an existing bus route, with stops within easy walking distance. Retford also has a key railway station on the east coast mainline, providing services to London, Edinburgh, Hull, Leeds and Sheffield, making Retford a desirable commuter town
221	33	The site is located approximately 1 mile to the north of Retford town centre and is therefore within walking distance (20 minutes) of the facilities located there. In addition, the site is located in close proximity to an existing bus route, with stops within easy walking distance. Retford also has a key railway station on the east coast mainline, providing services to London, Edinburgh, Hull, Leeds and Sheffield, making Retford a desirable commuter town.
221	34	The site is also within easy access of a number of schools with capacity as well as a number of doctor's surgeries and dental practices. There are also a range of employment opportunities offered both in the town centre and other locations.
221	35	There are few constraints associated with the site, being largely flat and having no landscape features of intrinsic value within it (with the exception of boundary vegetation, which is capable of being largely retained).
221	36	The site is classified as Grade 3 agricultural land on the Agricultural Land Classification maps. It is noted that the majority of land adjoining the urban area of Retford is either Grade 3 or Grade 2 agricultural land, such that there are not any other sites of lower agricultural value than this site.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
221	37	The site is within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3. As the proposed use is housing, a non-polluting use, it is considered that this does not represent a constraint to the development of the site.
221	38	The site is within a 'conserve' Landscape Character Zone in the BLCA. However, there are no distinctive landscape features that would hinder the development of this site from a landscape character point of view. In addition, we note that the long-distance views of the site are filtered by the overlapping effect of hedgerows and trees. Views from the Idle Valley are also restricted because of the mature vegetation along Bolham Lane. It is therefore considered that the site has capacity in landscape terms to accommodate housing development.
221	39	Linden Homes has commissioned various appraisals including landscape, initial highways investigation and drainage. This information will be submitted to the Council in due course in support of the development of this site. The only constraint with the potential to affect the overall density of development on the site is a low-voltage power line that crosses the site in an east -west direction.
221	40	We have assessed the deliverability of the site against the tests set out in paragraph 54 of Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3) and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Practice Guidance. A site is considered to be deliverable, when it is suitable, available and achievable at the time of assessment. The assessment of deliverability of Tiln Lane, Retford (Site 37) is set out in Table 3.1 below
221	41	The site is suitable for housing development as: it offers a suitable location for development being located on close proximity to existing services; it would contribute to the creation of sustainable mixed communities through the potential to provide an appropriate mix and type of housing on the site; There are a number of potential access routes to the site from Tiln Lane; The identified constraints can be adequately dealt with; The development of the site would have no impact on any designated conservation areas or listed buildings; and the development of the site would not present any adverse conditions which would be experienced by prospective residents.
221	42	The site is available for residential development as there are no legal or ownership problems. The site is owned by our client, who has expressed an intention to develop the site for residential use at the earliest opportunity.
221	43	The site is controlled by our client who has undertaken a thorough assessment of the marketability and economic viability of the development of the site, including an assessment of any exceptional costs associated with the development of the site. The Tiln Lane site is considered to be achievable for residential development as there is a reasonable prospect that the site can be developed now or at any point in the plan period through the adoption of an appropriate phasing strategy.
221	44	The benefits of the development of Site 37 can be summarised as follows: The site would assist the Council in the delivery of its housing requirement over the plan period through the provision of approximately 250 dwellings; The site lies in a sustainable location in close proximity to Retford town centre (including all associated shops and services) with good public transport links and access to employment areas, schools with spare capacity and open space; The development of the site would not be detrimental to the landscape character of Retford; The development of the site would form an effective 'rounding-off' of the settlement in this part of Retford with the buildings lying to the north of Bolham Lane, without extending the settlement into the wider countryside; The site would offer a variety of house sizes and types to meet local need; The site would offer high quality public open space on site for prospective residents; and The site could be developed without significant adverse implications for environmental, cultural or historic assets and could be accommodated by existing infrastructure.
221	45	<p>Our Client, Linden Homes Strategic Land, has land interests at Tiln Lane, Retford and therefore is a key stakeholder in the District.</p> <p>5.2 Our Client has some concerns in relation to the screening criteria to be used in the identification of preferred options sites as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much emphasis is placed on local opinion of sites over other factors; • There is no consideration of the ability of housing development to support economic development; • There is not enough recognition of the type of development proposed in Groundwater SPZs; and • The landscape character criterion is too simplistic and ignores the capacity of sites to accommodate development. <p>5.3 Our Client considers that the residual housing requirement for Retford is too low as a number of sites have been included within the existing supply where planning permissions are either pending or have lapsed, such that they cannot be included in the supply under the SHLAA Practice Guidance. The capacity of another site has also been overestimated in the SHLAA .</p> <p>5.4 Our client believes that there are issues which impact on the deliverability of a number of sites at Retford, which has been identified in this report. Our client also notes that the Council has overestimated the capacity of what some sites could deliver.</p> <p>5.5 In the case of our Client's site at Tiln Lane, this represents a sustainable and deliverable site, which offers a number of benefits and can assist the Council in the delivery of the housing requirement for Retford in the plan period.</p> <p>5.6 Our Client is pleased to have the opportunity to comment on the current Site Allocation Issues and Options Consultation document and trust that their comments are useful to the Council.</p> <p>5.7 We look forward to receiving confirmation of your receipt of these representations in the first instance and to on-going engagement in relation to this and other LDF documents.</p>
221	46	The enclosed highways report sets out that a suitable highway access is achievable from Tiln Lane, whilst we note that the existing 30 mph speed limit will need to be extended to cover the site frontage onto Tiln Lane. A detailed assessment of the A620 Moorgate / Tiln Lane junction has been undertaken to demonstrate that the impact at this junction can be mitigated .

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
221	47	BWB Consulting have also liaised with Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) highways team who stated that for a site with more than 150 dwellings, two points of vehicular access, which as we note above this is achievable. The County Council also stated that the assessment of other junctions will be necessary, which we believe is a detailed issue that could be addressed at the planning application stage
221	48	We have also received detailed comments from NCC signals team on the junction proposals at the A620 Moorgate / Tiln Lane junction. Overall there are no objections in principal from the team and we believe that their comments could be satisfactorily addressed at the planning application stage.
221	49	The enclosed FRA report demonstrates that the site is shown to lie entirely within flood zone 1. Therefore residential development is considered an appropriate form of development from a flood risk perspective and should be considered sequentially preferable compared to sites with greater flood risk vulnerability. Rot is also noted that there are no drainage issues which would preclude the development of the site.
221	50	The enclosed landscape assessment sets out that the site does not lie within a landscape protected by any statutory or local landscape designation, for reasons of quality of character. It is also noted that the site contains no landscape features of intrinsic value.
221	51	Development of the site provides the opportunity for landscape enhancement, whilst longer distances view of the site are filtered by the overlapping effect of hedgerows and hedgerows trees. Therefore any new development would be seen in the context of the existing urban area and overall the report concludes that the development of the site would have a minimal effect on the landscape character of the surrounding landscape. Representations to Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation (already submitted via email) We note that the Council believes the residual requirement for Retford is 577 dwellings. However, the enclosed representations demonstrates that this should be increased to around 724 dwellings, which takes in account lapsed / refused permissions (99 dwellings) and a further 48 dwellings from the shortfall in the current outline application for a maximum of 178 dwellings, as opposed to the allocation for 226 dwellings. It is noted that the planning statement and transport assessment have been drafted on that basis. We also note that since this report was written, the outline application (Reference: 01/11/00311) now has a holding objection from Natural England due to lack of information. Therefore, whilst this may be resolved it does place further delays on the delivery of development on this site. The enclosed representations provides comments on the following sites, which we trust may assist the Council in the consideration which sites that they will select as preferred options:
221	52	Site 1 -Lansdowne Drive; Site 3 -London Road; Site 40 -Southfield; Site 51 -North Road; Site 52 -Alperton Road and Lansdowne Drive; Site 69 -Brixworth Way; Site 370 -Cavendish Street; and Site 511 -Grove Coach Road. The benefits of the development of Site 37 are summarised in the report, which sets out that the site lies in a sustainable location in close proximity to schools and Retford town centre, whilst also having the benefit of good public transport links and access to employment areas. The development of the site would form an effective "rounding off" of the settlement in this part of Retford, without significant adverse implication for environmental, cultural or historic assets and could be accommodated by existing infrastructure. We therefore trust that you will take these comments into consideration. Should you wish to discuss these with me further, please do not hesitate to contact me on 0113 2044 777.
222	1	I strongly disagree with the planning around the south east of Retford plots 27,3,370,511,488 as all this area is a flood plain if this area where to be built on it would add to the flooding of Blackstock lane, Trent street and the bottom of Broken Lane and Grove Coach road.
222	2	yes but in areas that will not and flooding to existing properties, area 41,52 and around Ordsall and 7,46&309.
222	3	1,52,40,41,364,7,46,309,37,512,10,70
222	4	51 & R7 the edge of town
222	5	I do not think housing and business use should be mix.
222	6	I have letter from BDC Principal Planner Mr D Askwith ref 1/1/94/173 dated 27/03/95 assuring my father threat plot 511 and the surrounding area would not be built as I would like to draw your attend to reasons 5 and 6.
222	7	The site has a history of flooding and its development is likely to expose potential residents to unacceptable risks and also increase the flooding risk occurring further down stream.
222	8	No clear satisfactory means of access.
222	9	This area of open space is also the home to a family of buzzards and Barn owls, so building housing here would move them on.
222	10	NO, built on area that will not flood. Severn Trent also back the objection to planning on site 370 and 511 in 1995 and the new plans as the upgrading of the sewage was to costly in the 1990's. as the drain at the bottom of Trent street cannot cope at the minute and adds to the flooding at that part of town. They also need to add a land drain from the bottom of bra ken lane to the river idle to prevent/ reduce current problem that they could not afford, so extra housing would compact this problem.
222	11	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
222	12	No traveller means travelling so why do we need long term sites. surely caravan type hook ups would be better. where they pay rent and fuel like the rest of us.
222	13	together but controlled and monitored so we don't get a dale farm issue.
222	14	not in this area but old factory sites and closed mining sites
223	1	In the current economic climate, creating job opportunities for existing residents should be paramount. In my view there is very little need for further housing, as the housing market in Worksop, Gateford and the surrounding areas is already saturated. Personaly, I would like to see very little additional housing development (maximum 500 houses)

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
223	2	I think location 35 is unsuitable as this is some of the only 'natural' open space remaining in Gateford. In addition, the existing housing developments at Gateford are already stretching the insufficient infrastructure and local amenities.
223	3	Site location 4/W9 is an area of Worksop that I believe would benefit greater from redevelopment, as the mixed use capability of this site offers greater potential to create employment opportunities for existing residents.
223	4	W4/9
223	5	Option 3 - greater bias towards employment land
223	6	Yes - although I am not sure exactly what criteria you use to determine which open space should be protected. Sites 35, 28 and W6 for instance are some of the only remaining natural (i.e. not man-made by a housing developer at the request of the council) areas of land surrounding the already vast Gateford estates, which are regularly used (more so than the potential protected land) for recreational use. Why not protect this farmland and develop the areas of Worksop that are in need of development, so that residents can continue to enjoy some of the natural beauty of the area?
223	7	Option A
223	8	I am writing to express my concern over planned use of site 35 for additional housing. Firstly, in my view, planned to build further housing in the Worksop area in light of the current economic conditions seem to defy logic. The housing market in Worksop has stagnated in the past few years, with supply (particularly of 3,4 & 5 bedroom houses in the Gateford area following the excessive development of the Ashes Park and Ladywalk/Kingfisher Walk areas) far outstripping demand. Further development of the area (i.e. through the development of site 35) would exaggerate this problem more so, placing additional downward pressure on house prices for existing residents
223	9	The only possible reason that I can think of for even contemplating further housing development in this area at the current time is to raise additional revenue for the Council to try and mitigate the impact of Government imposed cutbacks/austerity measures.
223	10	In my view, Worksop and the surrounding areas would benefit more at the present time from the development of 'brown field' sites i.e. sites that are in need of development, for commercial use to create much needed jobs for existing residents. Further housing development would merely continue to swell the local population and push the local infrastructure, which is already at capacity, to breaking point.
223	11	In addition, given the number of sites in Worksop and the surrounding areas that are in need of development, why choose to build additional housing on some of the only remaining agricultural land in the area? This land needs to be protected, more so that The odd areas of grass left behind by housing developers, such that some of the natural beauty of the area will remain for future generations. I, along with many others, regularly use the bridleway along the side of site 35 for recreational purposes.
223	12	Further housing development in this area would also increase the level of traffic, making the already busy roads even busier (the junction from Ashes Park Avenue onto Gateford road is a particular hotspot), increasing noise, pollution levels and endangering the safety of children pedestrians and cyclists
223	13	Only in the past few years have I have noticed wildlife start to return to the Ashes Park area, following a huge expanse of farmland being decimated by housing development. It would be a huge shame to see Site 35, with its proximity to Owday Woods, and being some of the only remaining natural agricultural land in Gateford, being developed into housing and having the same detrimental effect on the local wildlife. I trust you will factor my concerns into your development plans.
223	14	It has been brought to my attention that the farmland immediately to the East of the bridleway edging site 35 was approved by the Bassetlaw planning committee in 2009 as a conservation area ('the old Gateford conservation area'). The map showing site 35 in the consultation document appears to include land that encroaches on to this conservation area. Whilst this may not in itself prohibit the development of the parts of site 35 that do not fall within the conservation area, it must be noted that any development on site 35, particularly towards the eastern side of the site immediately adjacent to the conservation area, would clearly have a detrimental effect on the protected land and local wildlife.
224	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
224	2	Disagree, I believe UP TO 6 homes should be built are the residents wishes.
224	3	The sites to be considered for development are sites 105,203,497.
224	4	Sites numbered 101,107,& 496 should not be considered because of their close proximity to busy highways and the adverse effect traffic noise would have on the quality of life for the residents of such homes.
224	5	The planning permission should not be protected. If a public house is to be built it should be located near to sites 6/4 & 6/7as previously applied for by the parish council.
224	6	Site 106 should not be considered for development. It is outside the envelope of the village.
224	7	It is a significant open space abutting the settlement used for agricultural purposes.
224	8	There is at least one underground fuel-oil pipeline of strategic importance crossing this site. I believe that it serves a number of military establishments and I am not sure if all the government departments with a vested interest in the pipeline are included in the planning process. You will know the answer to that, and I trust you will look into it.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Response number	Comment	
224	9	Have the Environmental Agency conducted a "water cycle study" ? The number of houses completed in the recent past coupled with the number of houses under construction & those for which planning consents have been given suggests that such a survey should be carried out.
224	10	REFERENCE Q35. I suggest that ALL BROWN FIELD SITES ARE DEVELOPED BEFORE ANY GREENFIELD SITES ARE CONSIDERED.
224	11	All open spaces should be protected.
224	12	Yes I do, for the following reasons. Presumably these sites were chosen because they offered the best opportunity for the residents to follow their chosen way of life. They therefore offer the logical choice for expansion of these facilities.
224	13	These should be provided together. The cultural needs of the travelling people occupying the transit pitches are more likely to be understood by the occupants of the adjoining residential pitches than the majority of the rest of society. This will reduce the potential for conflict and unrest within the general community.
224	14	I know of no suitable land.
225	1	No comments
225	2	Option A: Spread between Workop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
225	3	No - There is sufficient out line planning permission already granted for additional housing development within the village. Also there doesn't seem to be a demonstrable demand for 13 more. In addition, this would put a extra strain on utilities/services (i.e. schools, parking, water, elec)
225	4	No - view is as above for question 66.
225	5	Preference is none of the sites. If there is a genuine need for housing then this should be infill areas (453,296)
225	6	I believe that site 491 has now been removed from the allocated list. If this is so can this be confirmed? If not we would oppose this site being developed as it is a green belt piece of land with hedgerows and wildlife (bats, barn owls etc).
225	7	yes - they should be protected.
225	8	In existing sites if there is a need. There is already spare capacity on existing sites, these should be used.
225	9	As per current arrangements.
226	1	No
226	2	I believe location 35 is unsuitable as an area for new housing.
226	3	Option A
226	4	I would like to express my objection against the potential development of up to 700 new houses on the fields to the side of Gateford Hill Nursing Home, site 35 in the document. This is like a development the size of Shireoaks (618 houses) being added to the estate. The affects to an already large estate would be: significantly increased traffic jams exiting & entering the estate
226	5	many more cars causing danger to our children
226	6	strain on schools & services
226	7	worse traffic jams at local shops
226	8	ruined views & privacy for many homeowners
226	9	construction road damage & years of mess
226	10	destruction of versatile and currently farmed agricultural land
226	11	destruction of beautiful countryside
226	12	detrimental effects on Owday & Whipman woods, Owday Plantation (site of importance for Nature Conservation)
226	13	lost bridleway/footpath hedgerows
226	14	lost beautiful land frequented by many walkers daily
226	15	increased pollution
226	16	I do not agree with Criteria 4, allowing housing to be built on agricultural land. Nor do I agree that grade 3 should be built on no matter if it is grade 3a or 3b. Only grade 4 and 5 land should be considered at an absolute outside, and as per my first statement I do not think any agricultural land should be built on.
226	17	No
226	18	I strongly believe site 35 is unsuitable for development.
226	19	Yes
227	1	Yes
227	2	Option A
227	3	Land should be allocated in Elkesley for 11 new houses, but no more than 11 new houses.
227	4	Yes 33 new houses in the village will change the rural nature here, the reason for moving into Elkesley for many is the Rural nature of this village.
227	5	247, 249 only,

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
227	6	Mains Gas is not available in Elkesley, considering the spiralling nature of heating oil prices, new developments without mains gas should not be considered.
227	7	Yes open spaces should be protected for the enjoyment of all that use them, rural villages should be protected from greedy developers.
227	8	No new space should be allocated.
227	9	Together
227	10	Under no circumstances should 244 be developed.
228	1	Yes I agree
228	2	I believe the 4% housing growth for Carlton-in-Lindrick & Langold is sufficient to cover the next 16 years.
228	3	Site number 174 would be my first choice as access to this land looks quite good
228	4	My second choice is site number 219 for the same reason.
228	5	The enjoyment of living in our property. If new houses are built close by this could be a detrimental factor for many people, I know new houses are required for future growth but this should be a major consideration.
228	6	I do believe open spaces should be protected. I can however only comment on the open farm land adjacent to where I live on Shire Close. This is a very pleasant peaceful view, the stream attracts wildlife of all kinds and we would not want to see this lost to any form of development.
228	7	Option B: Focused in just one of the above towns?
228	8	Gypsy and Traveller sites should probably remain in and around their current locations this would help them to stay in close contact.
228	9	I see no reason why they should not be together, it must be better for everyone concerned.
229	1	No issues on the screening.
229	2	However, I would like to object formally to the use of 41 & 364 as housing.
229	3	This is an open field and does not require housing.
229	4	Any new properties as a new development in that area will overlook my property, possibly overshadow my property.
229	5	It will cause additional noise, disturbance or other problems that means that you cannot enjoy my property in the same way that I currently can. It is extremely quiet where I live.
229	6	Also I object on the grounds of privacy. At the moment I have no-one overlooking my property at the back and would object to houses overlooking me.
229	7	Natural environment - that area has a lot of animals and open fields that gain birds and wildlife and I object that their habitat will be lost.
229	8	Increase of traffic - I object that there will be more traffic going down the Ordsall and Ollerton Road if more houses are built.
229	9	I do not think Retford needs any further housing. Employment growth is important but I believe there are plenty of housing available in Retford. I have checked the housing website for months now and there are plenty of properties that have been available for several months that are not selling.
229	10	I have no objection to the following sites: 51, 37, 512, 533, 7, 46, 309, 6, 69, 342, 10, 70, 71 and 336
229	11	R7
229	12	R7 - Good links to Doncaster and close to A1 via Blyth. Good for employment and housing.
229	13	The Tiln Lane area needs to have a new road and new housing in that area would bring a new road as infrastructure and would solve a lot of problems as this needs to be dealt with anyway so might as well deal with housing issues and road problems all in one go.
229	14	As mentioned above I would like to formally object to any planned housing on 41, 364 especially. I also object to 40, 52 & 1 for the reasons listed above in section 1.
229	15	I think that the areas that should be protected are Kings Park, the area in Hallcroft and Ordsall.
229	16	Children's play areas are important.
229	17	There does appear to be many blank fields in the Retford area.
229	18	The area in Hallcroft as much as it is a good play area it is vast and not all that space is needed.
229	19	The area at the bottom of Ordsall Road 1/81 across the road from that area should be made available for housing as well.
229	20	I think it is more important for sites to be redeveloped rather than fields and green spaces be used for new housing.
229	21	Option A
229	22	Existing sites. The current sites cause no problems or very little problems. At the meeting I attended no-one knew where the sites were currently located. This is clearly ideal. I think the current sites should be upgraded for the Gypsy and Traveller groups.
229	23	No opinion.
229	24	No opinion.
229	25	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
229	26	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
229	27	There will be a significant loss of amenity
229	28	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
229	29	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
229	30	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
230	1	Yes I agree
230	2	Option A.
230	3	I would like to see the minimum amount of housing in the village and if housing is created it should fit in with the existing brickwork - using reclaimed bricks and roofing tiles. At the moment the village has a mixture of several different housing types (bungalows, detached and all using different materials)which can spoil the look of the village and it needs to be preserved for time to come. I would not like to see these houses used for social housing.
230	4	410 - as this is currently an existing site. I would prefer not to develop any other land unless it is converting a building or barn which is already falling down and built.
230	5	Traffic congestion to Gams ton is terrible - the mph should be readdress to a 30 mph zone.
230	6	Access to gas and the mains can be an issue this is why i prefer to develop existing sites as they will already have these amenities.
230	7	It would be good to have some additional recreational facilities in the area - tennis courts or perhaps a football pitch for the children etc where there is an honesty box where you can pay as you play- can this be used at site 410 where they may already exist???
230	8	Limited development should be on site 410. I would like to see this for small number of housing but not for social housing and to keep the character of the listed building and the fields behind 410.
230	9	Could this area be used for the community (ie) tennis and badminton clubs.
230	10	I would like to see it developed for limited housing or to become another private school.
230	11	Depends upon how large the existing location is. I think it is best to keep them in the same area as long as they do not get too large.
230	12	Together as it is better to contain in one area. However we have had issues with gypsy and traveller thefts in the area and criminal damage to our property so i would prefer not to see it in the Gams ton area.
230	13	None.
231	1	Yes, we agree.
231	2	Option B: Focused in just one of the above towns?
231	3	Yes, however we think there should also be new affordable homes for younger people in the village.
231	4	Site 220 is the most appropriate site for the new homes to go on.
231	5	Traffic on Retford road is bad during the morning school drop off.
231	6	Yes, all green spaces should be protected.
231	7	Around existing sites.
231	8	No Comment
231	9	None
232	1	Yes, I agree with the methodology
232	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
232	3	I believe more than 14 should be allowed on site 228 as this will help support our school and shop.
232	4	228 is the most appropriate site, but 483 would be my second choice.
232	5	Site 230 now have a play area on and permission for a village bowling green.
232	6	Yes, these should be protected.
232	7	Existing sites.
232	8	None
232	9	None
233	1	Yes.
233	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
233	3	I believe over an 18 year period the village could see more than 14 new houses.
233	4	sites 468 and 437 are best suited for housing development
233	5	sites 294 and 286 flood and have issues with access and heritage. Any building development on these would impact negatively to the village.
233	6	I agree that the open spaces should be protected.
234	1	No comment
234	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
234	3	I believe that 6 new houses is more than enough for Beckingham to absorb, and I also believe that "one offs" should be included in the calculations.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Response number	Comment	
234	4	Site 101, this is the quietist side of the by-pass and would be least affected by road noise.(prevailing winds are westerly).
234	5	The Public House should never have been sited on 106.
234	6	The original site opposite site 107 should have been granted.
234	7	I would therefore like to see site 106 in its entirety become open space for the enjoyment of everyone.
234	8	Land drainage pipes, and oil-pipelines are underground in this field and considering the problems with land drainage we have had in recent years; (a solution costing £14000 was imposed on us)full consideration should be given to these issues when considering planning applications.
234	9	Make site 106 an open space.
234	10	No new sites please.
234	11	No new sites please.
235	1	This is a village, not a town. There are still many secondhand houses as yet to sale.
235	2	This is enough housing for Hayton. No pubs, no shops, and school full in Clarborough and few buses.
235	3	The sites 478 and 541 have an electricity pylon and a much used walk way through farm entrance.
235	4	REMOVED
235	5	No
236	1	We wish to comment on the suitability of sites 7, 46, 309 and 533. There is already a traffic problem with HGVs and school traffic along Tiln Lane and at the end of Tiln Lane/Moorgate Junction.
236	2	The other road access to the town is via Longholme Road/Welham Road. Either, or both, the above would become even more dangerous if development took place on any of the above sites.
236	3	Although this area is probably the highest point of the town, there is an on going drainage problem which has probably occurred as a result of:
236	4	a) the developments which have taken place on almost every available site in this area; and
236	5	b) the type of subsoil which becomes saturated and therefore does not allow water to drain away.
237	1	The Corner Farm site will have need of considerable modification of the junction at the bottom of Clarborough Hill because of all the extra cars and delivery vehicles involved with 19 houses. The extra traffic on Smeath Lane will also cause problems at the Tiln Lane/Moorgate Junction as well as creating further hazards for the school traffic.
237	2	Presumably any builder would have to make a significant contribution to the costs of the above, thus making the idea of affordable housing a pipe dream. Unless the oft discussed Welham bypass became a reality!
237	3	The location of my house, overlooking the Broad Gores site, will lay me open to a charge of nimbyism but my main objection is that during wet weather the field is a quagmire. In 2007 my house was flooded with 3"-4" of water and took 5 months to dry out.
237	4	The drains on my road could not cope and water ran down my drive, into the front of my house, to be met by water cascading down my back garden and into the rear of the house. Building on this field will exacerbate this problem as a drain that was installed many years ago cannot cope.
238	1	I disagree that land should be allocated, in Blyth, for nine new houses. To support this I submit: a) that there are many houses that have been for sale for lengthy periods without buyers being found;
238	2	b) of recent new developments some remain unsold (again after lengthy periods);
238	3	c)the village infrastructure cannot support additional numbers.
238	4	590 & 517 - difficult to be subjective when no information is provided detailing the standard of property to be developed.
238	5	Existing sites (Gypsy and Traveller) should be developed.
238	6	e.g. the one close to Daneshill Lakes should be refurbished and utilised.
239	1	I am writing to put forward my objections regarding the building of residential site no 1, 40 and 52 of the Bassetlaw development map. 1) It will increase traffic flow through Retford, which at the moment is awful, also it will increase traffic on the adjoining roads through Ordsall which are treacherous enough.
239	2	2) There is a bridleway that runs directly through this area and this will have to remain which will spoil the walks of the countryside and we know there is not much countryside left in Retford and Ordsall.
239	3	3) The wildlife will suffer because they will have no where to wander freely. We see many birds, ducks, foxes, hedgehogs and other wild creatures on the fields.
239	4	I live on St Andrews Way directly opposite the bridleway. There is no path through onto our road, but numerous people still cut across our land and climb over the fence because they can't be bothered to walk the proper way through, so this will encourage more young people who gather on the path for drinking, riding motorcycles up and down. If these houses are built this will only increase.
239	5	I feel we have enough housing being built at the moment in Retford and Ordsall. I feel we need more industry and shops to be encouraged in the town and create more work for those that already live here. Also to encourage people into Retford for shopping, eating etc.
240	1	In my opinion, giving residents questionnaires to fill in will result in a low response. I think greater consultation and clear guidelines should be given before any decisions can be made.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
240	2	Why should we be given a say to this question?
240	3	No. I think the attraction of the village would be greatly reduced with additional housing.
240	4	None, see above.
240	5	No. I think the attraction of the village would be greatly reduced with additional housing.
240	6	Yes, they should be protected.
240	7	REMOVED
240	8	See 121.
240	9	See 121.
241	1	I am concerned about site nos. 7, 46 and 309 ... I would like to raise objections for the following reasons: 1) The area highlighted is prime greenbelt which currently enjoys wildlife habitat with a large area covered by willows and there are many hedgerows which would obviously disappear and with them the habitat of various species.
241	2	There are public footpaths enjoyed by the local community which would also be lost.
241	3	We would lose the privacy which we currently enjoy in living down a private road. The residents on the Drive do have covenants preventing building in the areas 46 and 309, there would seem little point in spending time and effort in the planning department on areas that could not be built on.
241	4	The increased amount of traffic generated by building 899 houses, in an area that currently struggles with heavy traffic, particularly by Carr Hill School and Tiln Lane beggars belief. I do not believe we have sufficient infrastructure in the community to cope with such a large number of houses in this area. Can you imagine the number of school places and medical facilities required for such a large development?
241	5	I believe there is a particular problem with flooding at the bottom of areas 46 and 309. I am not sure whether it is the water table or the drainage, but the area floods very quickly with heavy rains.
241	6	It is hard to imagine with the current glut of housing in the Retford area and the lack of jobs and industry which is unlikely to change why the council would want to build even more houses. I understand that there already some 1500 houses built from 2006, or to be built, including housing on old school sites. Why ruin the landscape and environment with additional housing which is unlikely to be required in the foreseeable future.
241	7	There has been a lot of publicity lately on the number of flats/houses that are empty. It appears in Bassetlaw nearly 4% of homes are empty yet the council wants to build more homes on greenbelt and ruin the environment.
241	8	Finally, if the council decide that extra housing is required and all brownfield sites have been utilised, then it appears from the development plan there are areas which are less obtrusive on the environment than development on sites 46 and 309, for example the land at the end of Ordsall, no's 1, 52, 41, 48 and 364. These would provide ample housing to fulfil your requirements and also provide easier access to the main motorways than development of areas 7, 46 and 309, which would significantly increase traffic congestion through Retford in trying to get to the motorway network.
241	9	I believe it would be preferable to provide mixed use sites thus creating employment and housing and the sites identified in the consultation document would in fact provide the housing requirement. The advantages of these areas being on the side of Retford to provide access to the motorway network without the need to increase congestion in the town
241	10	I also think that if the extra housing is built in a location where extra facilities can be built at the same time, this would prove more beneficial than having lots of smaller sites round the town which could necessitate more facilities being required than if the extra housing was in one or two locations.
242	1	Land north of Badgers Chase, Durham Grove, Palmer Road, Bigsby Road and Park Lane, Retford. I have note the proposals and make objections, principally on the basis that the existing road system on Tiln Lane is inadequate to cope with the additional traffic that will inevitably be generated. One of the things that would help alleviate some of this additional traffic would be the building of the Welham bypass, or even bypass all of Claborough as well, thus taking even more traffic away from Tiln Lane. I trust that the sewerage systems etc. will be suitably upgraded.
243	1	I live at the Drive and have just become aware of various areas that seem to be zoned for housing. The particular areas I am concerned about are no's 7, 46 and 309 which in total show some 899 houses could be built on these areas. I would like to raise my objections for the following reasons:
243	2	1) The area highlighted is prime greenbelt which currently enjoys wildlife habitat with a large area covered by willows and there are many hedgerows which would obviously disappear and with them the habitat of various species.
243	3	2) There are public footpaths enjoyed by the local community which would also be lost.
243	4	3) We would lose the privacy which we currently enjoy in living down a private road. The residents on the Drive do have covenants preventing building in the areas 46 and 309, there would seem little point in spending time and effort in the planning department on areas that could not be built on. 4) The increased amount of traffic generated by building 899 houses, in an area that currently struggles with heavy traffic, particularly by Carr Hill School and Tiln Lane beggars belief. I do not believe we have sufficient infrastructure in the community to cope with such a large number of houses in this area. Can you imagine the number of school places and medical facilities required for such a large development?
243	5	5) I believe there is a particular problem with flooding at the bottom of areas 46 and 309. I am not sure whether it is the water table or the drainage, but the area floods very quickly with heavy rains.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
243	6	6) It is hard to imagine with the current glut of housing in the Retford area and the lack of jobs and industry which is unlikely to change why the council would want to build even more houses. I understand that there already some 1500 houses built from 2006, or to be built, including housing on old school sites. Why ruin the landscape and environment with additional housing which is unlikely to be required in the foreseeable future.
243	7	7) There has been a lot of publicity lately on the number of flats/houses that are empty. It appears in Bassetlaw nearly 4% of homes are empty yet the council wants to build more homes on greenbelt and ruin the environment.
243	8	Finally, if the council decide that extra housing is required and al brownfield sites have been utilised, then it appears from the development plan there are areas which are less obtrusive on the environment than development on sites 46 and 309, for example the land at the end of Ordsall, no's 1, 52, 41, 48 and 364. These would provide ample housing to fulfil your requirements and also provide easier access to the main motorways than development of areas 7, 46 and 309, which would significantly increase traffic congestion through Retford in trying to get to the motorway network.
243	9	1. The total number of houses required is 577 and the advantages of having these on a limited number of mixed sites i.e. housing and employment are that there can be economies of infrastructure, more opportunity for the provision of new service, schools, surgeries and shops rather than a piecemeal approach resulting in overloading current infrastructure
243	10	2. The best locations in my opinion are those on the North West and South West which could accommodate the housing requirement alongside employment opportunities. They also give easier access to major motorways without causing even more traffic congestion, particular at work times
243	11	3. By contrast building on sites 46/309/7 would present additional problems for the area which would make them less desirable for development
243	12	Traffic in this area would significantly increase on Tilt and Moorgate with increased congestion, these roads cannot cope with the current levels of traffic trying to get through Retford
243	13	The fields particularly in 46/309 suffer from flooding, I believe the water table in this area is just below the surface
243	14	Residents of the Drive have covenants on site 309 preventing building so it is hard to understand when you say this is developable by the landowners
244	1	We agree as long as there is a spread of types of houses to include affordable housing to help ages of village dwellers. However, any more than 12 will severely affect the village.
244	2	If 19 houses were to be built at Corner Farm we would like to include affordable/first time buyer properties and these houses should be part of the allocation for Q45.
244	3	Site 170 is at present just open rough land and would be ideal for development provided the access route from Smeath Lane to Big Lane, via Broad Gores, is kept blocker (no through road).
244	4	Clarborough/Hayton would benefit from revival of Post Office/shop.
244	5	Yes - open spaces should be protected.
245	1	I would agree that enough land should be allocated in Wheatley for the provision of at least 12 new houses given the potential population growth of the village over the next 16 years. Perhaps it is more likely that it could be doubled and especially if there is demand for low cost housing. It is probable that past growth has been limited by the constraint of the village envelope.
245	2	Having read the Bassetlaw Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation Paper for the Wheatley conurbation along with the satellite map on Page 5 which identifies 5 'orange' coloured sites as being those available for development, I would suggest the following preferred allocation along with my reasoning for the choice.
245	3	My preferred choice would involve three of the potential sites, being those numbered 236, 237 and 238. I would suggest that the new housing could be sites along a 'strip' of land on each of these sites being in the case of plot 238, to the north of this field bordering Top Pasture Lane and for 236 and 237, to the south of these, again bordering Top Pasture Lane.
245	4	I believe that the allocation of a strip of land on these three sites would be preferential since: 1) This area seems to be a natural extension to the current boundaries of the village and as a 'strip' it would follow both the existing building lines along Top Pasture Lane and also be in balance with the current housing at the terminus end of Low Pasture Lane, these premises specifically being known as The Ferns and Romerie.
245	5	Such a development should fit within the apparent requirement of the Wheatley residents for no large extensions or infill to the village and additionally it will keep the new housing away from the nearby busy Gainsborough Road.
245	6	Top Pasture Lane is not a main through route for the village and hence does not carry a lot of vehicle traffic. In reality it is effectively a cul de sac, other than it provides access to the fields along the lower end of its route, but this being principally for agricultural use. In consequence it seems unlikely that any new housing should disproportionately increase this traffic or the resulting risk. Additionally, there should not be a problem in providing off road parking for each of the new housing developments.
245	7	if development was concentrated in this area then it would assist in limiting the disruption to the wider village during the building period of the new housing and also maximise the benefit from the costs required to improve the local infrastructure , such as water, sewerage provision and the necessary extension of the existing metalled section of Top Pasture Lane to provide due access.
245	8	A strip development should not cause any overshadowing or intrusion into the privacy of the existing housing currently located on either Top Pasture Lane or Low Pasture Lane.
245	9	Loss of trees or hedgerows - I do not believe that any trees would need to be lost and also depending on the layout of the development, although some of the existing hedgerows will need to be removed to provide access for the new homes. Perhaps a large proportion could be retained as a frontage to them.
245	10	Reasons for discounting the two other potential sites: Site 239 - It would be possible to carry out some roadside strip development on this land being either on its frontage to Low Street or the link road between Low Street and Gainsborough Road. My comments are as follows:

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
245	11	1) Low Street Frontage: This location fronts what is the main through road for the village. Would development of this site lead to an increase in traffic at the already busier end of Low Street and at a point close to its intersection with Top Street, which is already a blind corner for drivers and where the road appears narrower? Also, being between existing buildings would this be against the apparent wishes of the Wheatley residents in not wanting to 'infill'?
245	12	On the link road, although this location does not have the same traffic issue as point 1 (above) and also seem to fit within the Wheatley residents' wish to only allow small extensions to the village, I would still rank it behind development of sites 236 and 238 on the basis of localising disruption to the village, maximising the infrastructure improvement costs and its proximity to Gainsborough Road.
245	13	Site 464 - I consider this to be the least desirable site given both the limited access to it (through narrow routes), that any housing on here would be immediately behind and hence potentially compromising the privacy to the rear of existing houses on both Eastfield and Top Pasture Lane and it would effectively constitute infill.
245	14	I note that reference has been made to provision of affordable housing within the results of the residents' questionnaire but as it appears (according to point 10.93 of the SAI&O Paper) that there have been no affordable housing completions in N&S Wheatley over the last five years, has enough weight been given to this?
245	15	If there is a requirement for affordable housing, depending on the alternatives, I believe it could be accommodated within the area of sites 236 to 238.
245	16	Yes, I agree with the current 7 green sites as shown on the Wheatley plan should be retained as they provide attractive open areas within the village and especially those around the village playing fields being numbered 36/3, 36/4, 36/6, 36/7, which are a valuable amenity.
246	1	Site references 206, 358, 359.
246	2	yes.
247	1	I have lived in the village for ... years and very much consider myself part of the local community. Some ... years ago, following announcement of its imminent closure, my wife and I took over the running of the post office and set up the village store. This has been hard work, not least in setting it up in the first place, yet has proved extremely rewarding from a local village perspective. As a local service provider, I am strongly of the opinion that, moving forward, our village will rely on new housing development to sustain existing local village services and facilities which are extremely important to us all and therefore fully support the level (12) of new housing proposed for the village in your consultation document.
247	2	Owing to the size of the village, I would be in favour of the 12 new houses being provided via a number of smaller sites and can confirm that this view is shared by a number of local residents when visiting my post office and shop. I note from the plan in the consultation document that there are a number of possible sites put forward for new housing. Given that we only need to accommodate 12 new houses, some of the sites shown seem much too large and could erode the special character of the village, particularly if developed for a significant number of houses.
247	3	I am therefore particularly supportive of site no 236 and consider this to represent a logical small extension to the existing village boundary.
247	4	I am also aware that the owner of this site has also been in discussions with the adjacent owner of 'Whitegates' with a view to joining their two parcels of land. The two parcels seem to be well contained by existing hedgerows and largely within the existing built form. If brought forward together, I feel these two sites could provide the opportunity to contribute towards meeting the Council's housing requirement for the village with little impact on the character of the area and minimal disturbance to existing residents. If this site is indeed brought forward as an extended part of site no. 236, I would be happy to support their combined allocation to accommodate some of this settlement's new housing development.
248	1	As victims of the 2007 floods we are somewhat taken aback to find that land around our area is to be considered for potential building sites. After the floods we were promised many different ideas to alleviate the problem of excessive water in the drainage dyke at the bottom of our garden. We would point out that NOTHING has been done as promised – namely that the dyke would be cleared out, re-directed to slow the flow down and also a holding tank further up the dyke. Not only did we have problems with the vast amount of water but also with the sewerage system. Many times during that summer we suffered the indignity of being unable to use toilet facilities and had to resort to buying a chemical toilet. The culvert under Bracken Lane is totally inadequate and the pumping station also on Bracken Lane is unable to cope when it rains heavily allowing both surface water and sewerage to back up into the drains thereby rendering the toilets, washing facilities and washing machine unable to be used. We are enclosing photographs showing the extent of the flood water affecting our property and hope you will take this information and evidence into account when making your decisions.
249	1	I have recently learnt of your decision to permit development of over 1000 homes in the area just north of Park Lane. My initial reaction is quite negative as this equates to a suburb of about 5000 people across the Retford border and into the surrounding agricultural land.
249	2	This would completely damage the nature of the area and although I was aware of some long term development possibilities in this area there has been no public consultation or discussion prior to this announcement what is of such a mammoth site.
249	3	It could be that your presentation was just to initial such public debate but its presentation in the press seemed to indicate it was to happen. If that were so the road traffic implications for Tiln Lane and its egress at the A620 at the top of Moorgate Hill are alarming. This junction is difficult new and serving another 1000+ homes presents an alarming situation.
249	4	I walked around Cornwall Road, Bigsby Road, Tiln Land and Richmond Road around Christmas and there were about 10 houses currently up for sale so there seems adequate provision and some of the properties are not moving quickly.
249	5	Possibly one more development like Badgers Chase or Corn Hill Way is all the neighbourhood (and the economy) can sustain.
249	6	I myself am registered blind and am writing using electronic magnifier help. I could not read clearly the press map showing exactly the boundaries of the proposed development. May I have a copy of your map so I can see exactly from the source that is proposed. I may then be able to give you further comment about the area in which I have lived, at this address, since 1964.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
250	1	It all depends on what type of housing and where the houses are built. Hayton has a large variety of houses and bungalows and a building development could alter the look and feel of the very attractive and pleasant rural village, the same could be said of Claborough. Other than that planned Corner Farm development, I do not think a large scale development in either village would be of benefit to any of the residents.
250	2	On the original questionnaire sent out, the Corner Farm development had not been passed. I feel it is wrong to state that now that the development of Corner Farm has been passed, that it is not now to be included in the future planning, so we are faced with a further development. If the Corner Farm development goes ahead with 19 or more properties, I feel no further housing schemes apart from single property developments should be passed for Hayton and Claborough.
250	3	After the Corner Farm development, I do not think there should be any further development in Hayton or Claborough. I think it would be wrong for people to earmark development plots if (A) they do not live in the particular village they have suggested housing should be built and (B) A building plot or land should not be suggested if the plot is not near their own property. This then means that people can not influence the choice of a particular plot as far as possible from their own property.
250	4	A new development could seriously affect the diverse wildlife that exists in and around the villages. Wild deer live between Lecture Room Bridge (sites ref 173) and Narrow Bridge (site ref 180). Owls live in Rectory wood (site ref 478 and 544). Kingfishers live in the banks alongside the canal (site ref 182, 258, 173, 160 and 161). The hedgerows surrounding many of the plots are home to many species of birds including Blue and Great Tits, Greenfinches, Chaffinches, Wrens etc and there are cuckoos and woodpeckers in the villages. Rabbits, Hares, Pheasants, Squirrels and many other forms of wildlife in abundance.
250	5	Drainage could be a major issue. Nearly all the highlighted developments are to the east of Main Street in Hayton and Claborough. These properties would probably be below the level of the main sewer in Main Street. Both Claborough and Hayton have sewage pumping stations to deal with current properties that are to the East of Main Street. A new pumping station would need to be built to allow properties to be built East of Main Street. This may cause problems at Hayton sewage treatment works. Flow balancing may be required at the works if more flow and pump stations are added into the equation. Land drainage and flooding is an issue to the East of Main Street and the other parts of both villages. The issue will not improve as cuts in maintenance means ditching and diking is no longer carried at the correct intervals. This has been the reason for a number of flooding issues in both villages.
250	6	Public transport in the village is poor with and does not exist after 18:00 hours. A car is a necessity as all people who work need to travel outside villages.
250	7	Claborough village school could not cope with further developments as it is already full to capacity. Hayton, Welham and Clayworth do not have schools and use the school at Claborough. This is also the case with both village halls.
250	8	Overhead power lines cross the fields (site ref 478 and 541) as well as a public footpath. Many other public footpaths pass through the various potential housing plots.
250	9	All open greenfield spaces should be protected from development. There are many brown field sites and other derelict sites which could be developed before looking at these greenfield sites.
250	10	Existing gypsy sites should be assessed to see if they can be enlarged keeping the sites concentrated around existing sites.
250	11	I think it would be better to keep these pitches to an existing site.
250	12	I do not know of any land for Gypsy and Traveller sites.
250	13	Prior to purchasing our property 5 years ago, we checked with the Bassetlaw planning office, that the land to the rear of the property & also to the front (site ref 478 & 541), would not be built on. We were assured it was designated for greenbelt & could be used only for agricultural purposes. We then went ahead with the purchase, after these assurances were given. Surely, Bassetlaw planning can not now decide to ignore these designated areas & change them to development sites.
251	1	I have been a resident at the above address for 24 years. I feel I must write to show my opposition to the planned development of good agricultural land and as outlined in your plans for future building on plots outlined in your planning documents identified as plots 533, 512, 309, 154, 77, 70, 46, 37 and 7
251	2	Loss of good agricultural land
251	3	All Brownfield sites should be developed for housing before developing the edge of town and beyond the borough boundary
251	4	The proposal involved building outside the current borough boundary
251	5	Additional traffic congestion and danger to pedestrians and road users on Tiln Lane and surrounding roads
251	6	The development would change the character of the area
251	7	No consultation with residents prior to production of proposal
251	8	The present road infrastructure is unsuitable for further development
251	9	The proposal involves building outside the existing development envelope
252	1	Proposed developments to the North of Badgers Close, Durham Grove, Palmer Road, Bigsby Road and Park Lane. I would like to object to the above possible developments mainly because it would alter the character of the area and I believe that character of the market town of Retford. Do we need it to be larger?
252	2	Further more I think the extra traffic would have serious safety implications for road users and pedestrians, especially at school times when Tiln Lane outside the school is a dangerous bottle neck with heavy lorries, parked cars with parents picking up children and residents trying to get home.
252	3	I believe there are also doubts about the validity of the proposals due to lack of consultation, outside existing development envelope, outside borough boundary etc.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Response number	Comment	
252	4	The current building developments under review in Retford at present seem high with at least 600 properties either in progress or under planning in Ordsall alone, more in Hallcroft plus use of the redundant school properties still to be finalised, building should only be permitted on brown field or un-used land within town before use of green fields should even be considered. Furthermore, areas with in town where a development would up-grade the area should be considered i.e. Bolham Lane was previously up for planning.
252	5	Finally I would reiterate that people only come to Retford for what it is now, do not destroy that or destroy the approaches to Retford. (You came very close with the industrial estate off Randall Way)
253	1	The fields in our area cause flooding to homes at the bottom of our road (St Stephens Road)
253	2	At present access to these fields is totally unsuitable for heavy building traffic
253	3	With an increase in homes and families the present school would not be able to accommodate many more children. At present there are traffic problems when children are being dropped off and collected from schools.
253	4	With an increase in the population that these homes would bring, we feel that it would be a greater burden on the doctors and dentists. At present waiting times to see either can take weeks, months.
253	5	At present there is very little opportunity for the people of Retford to get employment. My own children had to obtain work out of the area.
253	6	I understand that a previous survey carried out 15 years ago showed that the present sewage system which flows under Retford Town centre is totally inadequate for any further increase.
254	1	Option B
254	2	Yes
254	3	178 213
254	4	Area 266 contains a public footpath, when we bought 50 Retford Road we were told that 266 could not be developed because the access to Retford Road would be unacceptable close to the A1 bridge.
254	5	Yes
254	6	Existing sites because infrastructure already exists.
254	7	Together to save expense of additional infrastructure
255	1	do not produce any concerns
255	2	This is prime agricultural land which is vital for the future economy of the country as imported food soars in price and the availability reduces.
255	3	There are mature hedgerows supporting an abundance of wildlife
255	4	There are no recreational areas within the vicinity
255	5	Most of these areas lie in a dip at the foot of a watershed and are frequently subjected to flooding. The drainage dykes and pumping station cannot always cope with the volume of water during a storm
255	6	Schools services and employment facilities are all on the other side of the town thus increasing the traffic flow through the centre of the town. This is at a time when we should be encouraging access to schools, services and employment to be within walking distance. The only school in the area is a junior school which is already oversubscribed.
255	7	Access to the A638 (London Road) is at present via Grove Coach Road which is already problematic due to restricted width and parked vehicles. The alternative is via Bracken Lane upon which a junior school is located.
255	8	Alternative access via Plot 3 would be too close to the restricted view of the railway bridge to be viable.
255	9	There are already many properties for sale in the area and the addition of houses on plots 27, 488 and 489 would probably create an oversupply situation.
255	10	There is already a shortage of work places within Retford thus causing residents to travel many miles to work. The cost of travel in terms of finance and the environment will become a critical issue in the near future. We should therefore consider redressing this problem before considering new housing schemes.
256	1	They should be in one place, as the location is known. There is plenty of space to extend. (Daneshill)
256	2	They should be together for the same reasons as in the last question.
256	3	No houses should be built in Sutton Village, because the council are not using the present ones correctly.
256	4	a) Problem people are being dumped on us to get them out of town. This is not right on us or them, as there are few busses, also a three hour gap in the middle of the day. There are also expensive, how do they get there shopping. In town they have cheaper busses or can walk.
256	5	b) Younger people are being put into bungalows and flats that were intended for the elderly of this village.
256	6	c) the houses get sold, and you have to build more, if you sell any should be with a twenty five year lease, so the council does not lose its stock.
256	7	If we have to be lumbered with the four, it should have a clause that they are for children of existing Sutton villages only.
257	1	I have been resident at the above address for 24 years. I feel I must write to show my opposition to the planned development of good agricultural land as outlined in your plans for future building on plots outlined in your planning documents.
257	2	Loss of good agricultural land
257	3	All brownfield sites should be developed for housing before developing the edge of town and beyond the borough boundary.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
257	4	The proposal involves building outside the current borough boundary
257	5	Additional traffic congestion and danger to pedestrians and road users on Tiln Lane and surrounding roads
257	6	The development would change the character of the area
257	7	No consultation with residents prior to production of proposal
257	8	The present road infrastructure is unsuitable for further development
257	9	The proposal involves building outside the existing development envelope
258	1	My family are concerned about the above proposal to build homes, travellers site and industrial sites on the fields around Retford. We feel we must state that we strongly object to this proposal on the following grounds: The fields in our area cause flooding to homes on our road
258	2	At present access to these fields is totally unsuitable for heavy building traffic
258	3	The present road (Grove Coach) could not cope with a further increase of traffic that more homes would bring. In addition to this type of traffic problem, it is impossible to get on to London road when there has been an accident on the A1
258	4	With an increase in homes and families the present school would not be able to accommodate many more children
258	5	With an increase in the population that these homes would bring, We feel that it would be a greater burden on the doctors and dentists. At present waiting times to see either, can take weeks
258	6	At present there is little opportunity for the people of Retford to get employment
258	7	In understand that a previous survey carried out 15 years ago pointed out that the sewage system would not cope with any further increase, unless you want to dig up the centre of Retford
258	8	I would also like to ask if the council considered the questionnaires they helped to base some of their findings (THE WHOLE TEN OF THEM) was emphasised in intended to have this mass building project. We for one did not know about the present proposals. Not until we see it highlighted in the Trader and Retford Times. In addition to the above as the powers to be ever carried out a survey in the Retford Area on the amount of Council homes that are vacant, industrial sites that have empty of derelict buildings. Also new housing estates that have empty homes, because people cannot afford them, the very latest information on mortgages is that it will be far more difficult for the first time buyer.
259	1	There have been more than 6 houses built since the survey and most not been sold. No more houses should be built as the village is plenty big enough for the few facilities it possesses.
259	2	No more sites should be developed as the village is already over developed. It is a rural community and should stay that way.
259	3	Planning permission should never have been given for the public house. It should have been allowed to be built on plot 107 as at least it might then attract passing trade. A housing estate off Station Road should never be passed because of all the heavy goods vehicle and very large agricultural machinery that constantly use the road. You only have to see how much congestion is caused when a couple of vehicles park on the road, especially the vans that are causing chaos at the moment which park on the junction with Low Street.
259	4	Why are 6/1, 6/2 and 6/5 protected areas? As far as I am aware they are they are not used for any specific purpose.
259	5	Surely plots 105, 106 and 203 are just as important. Do these just belong to land owners who are out to make a fast buck?
259	6	It the Council wants all these new developments in our village are we going to get a doctor's surgery, library, fast food outlets, butchers, swimming pool, supermarket etc. like our neighbouring village of misterton?
260	1	With so many houses empty in our area, why build on farm land etc. it makes no sense financially and ecologically so no.
260	2	No Cuckney is a lovely quiet village.
260	3	Traffic accidents are already a problem at the cross roads.
260	4	Why use farmland it makes no sense? Financially or ecologically!
260	5	Recommendation zero new dwellings
260	6	Use empty dwellings in area, refurbish
261	1	I am writing to inform you that I have a covenant on the fields OS78 and OS104 situated to the east of my property and would not like any buildings to be erected on them. I enclose a copy of the conveyance, made in 1960. I understand that other residents in The Drive have similar covenants.
261	2	Site 78 containing 3a.23p or thereabouts of grassland was then called or known as 'Pond Field' in the conveyance between Miss M A J Hurst and George Fredrick Baines dated 30 June 1948. The pond is still there. In severe weather I have seen standing water in the field and, if built upon, it would, in my opinion, become a flood plain. My house is said to be situated 53 feet above sea level but, in my inspection pit in the garage, the water table is only 2 feet below the surface. The pond is at a lower level than my garage.
261	3	In addition I have a covenant which states - forever hereafter to keep clear and un-built upon so much of the field Ordinance Survey Number 78 as is situate to the East of the property hereby conveyed and the whole of field Ordnance Survey 104 shown in the plan. The purchaser for himself, his successors in title and assigns to the intent and so as to bind etc... This covenant was not registered when i purchased the land in 1960 but was registered on the 24th October 1978 as a new regeneration.
262	1	I am very concerned to hear of the proposed development of potential housing on areas of prime green belt land around Retford – particularly areas 46, 309, 37, 512 and most especially no: 7 where 716 houses are planned.
262	2	This is an area of natural beauty – a significant wildlife habitat with hedgerows and public footpaths enjoyed by walkers and much of the local community.
262	3	The traffic in the Tiln Lane/Moorgate junction/ Bigsby Road would be vastly increased. It currently is already struggling to cope with huge HGV's Carr Hill School traffic and local traffic.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
262	4	We already have a glut of for sale/to let housing in the Retford Area – I do not believe there is a call for such huge numbers of extra housing – there is no extra industry or jobs for the additional population.
262	5	The character of the town will change
262	6	Local infrastructure will be seriously stressed
262	7	Traffic levels will be horrendous
262	8	Schools and doctor's surgeries will be oversubscribed
262	9	An area of natural beauty and wildlife habitat will be lost forever
263	1	As a long term resident of the above address I am co concerned at the proposal to build a large number of houses on land between the two roads of Broad Gores.
263	2	My main worry is the extra amount of traffic this will bring to what was once a quiet cul-de-sac. Since the development on St John drive the volume has increased considerably. At times car come speeding round the corner from Big Lane and it is surprising we haven't had any serious accidents.
263	3	In addition to the extra traffic there is also a problem parking. Most houses here have at least one car and several have two or three, some of which are inevitably parked half on the road and half on the pavement. It is quite difficult to negotiate a path through at times especially if a lorry is parked.
264	1	I would like to appeal against the proposed housing development around Palmer Road, Bigsby Road and Park Lane area.
264	2	The safety of School Children walking to and from school.
264	3	The traffic would at least treble causing danger to existing cars parked outside their home.
264	4	Extra traffic means more noise and fumes spoiling a quiet location
264	5	The development would ruin existing walking areas of one of the last green areas used by a number of rambling clubs and dog walkers
264	6	This green area where trees were grown for use at power stations instead of coal to stop the greenhouse gases
265	1	You are misleading the public when you say 'at least 12 new houses' the original questionnaire resulted in the residents expressing the strong view of 'an average of 12 houses'. The majority response was 'no new housing'.
265	2	It is my view, if corner Farm Development were not under consideration then small infill developments comprising 3 houses shared across most of the potential sites shown on P73 would be acceptable.
265	3	However all the issues for consideration outlined on P135 must be considered in particular: overshadowing, overlooking or loss of privacy. Design, appearance, layout, density and mass of buildings. Inadequate infrastructure to support the development. impact on public visual amenity.
265	4	It must be recorded that the Corner Farm Development of 19 new houses which would ALL be in Hayton equates to an increase of 15% over Hayton's current housing stock. This I believe would adversely affect the rural balance of the village.
265	5	Considerable damage was done to the rural nature of Clarborough when major housing development took place a few years ago.
265	6	In view of the potential Corner Farm development, it is my view that Clarborough/Hayton allocation is fulfilled. As detailed below in 'Observations', BDC ignored the advice of Hayton Parish Council in granting outline planning permission for 19 houses. Should this development move to a full planning application, then BDC criteria for assessment should be strictly enforced and the views of the public heeded.
265	7	See above
265	8	It can be debated ad nauseam whether there is a requirement in Bassetlaw for 6000 new houses especially when it is a recorded fact that there are substantial quantities of empty/derelict properties within the District. These should be given priority over new houses on either brownfield or greenfield sites.
265	9	Though the efforts of BDC and other bodies to attract employment are to be applauded, it would seem the high emphasis on new housing is misplaced. No one especially at Government level appears to have understood that unless 'UK Ltd' produces products which the world wants to buy, hence creating sound and sustained employment, then new housing simply is a luxury that cannot be afforded. New housing is a short term fix for the building industry and does nothing for our trade imbalance with the world.
265	10	Open space sites should be protected from any development as they are public assets.
265	11	New Gypsy and Traveller capacity should remain within the existing sites.
265	12	They should remain together as this would likely to be a more economic solution should they be separated.
265	13	No
265	14	It must be emphasised that a high majority of the responses to the questionnaire by Clarborough/Hayton wanted no new housing at all.
265	15	However, it seemed from Bassetlaw calculations that on average the community could absorb additional new housing of 12 units favouring 3 bed properties of semi or detached construction. There to be built over the next 5-7 years on either brownfield sites or as infills adjacent to existing properties.
265	16	In simple terms, should corner farm development proceed, then Clarborough/Hayton has more than fulfilled its allocation and no further development should be considered. It is sleight of hand to try to separate the corner farm allocation from any new proposed allocations.
266	1	I strongly object to the proposed housing development on land north of Retford, Reasons being;
266	2	The development will alter the character of the area.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
266	3	Loss of good agricultural land
266	4	Additional traffic
266	5	Highway safety
266	6	Loss of trees
267	1	Yes it is very well thought through and fair.
267	2	Bassetlaw Council have always preferred Worksop for Employment and Residential Development and I believe this has had an adverse effect on the town of Retford. We are in definite need of Employment sites together with executive style residential sites. Retford has a many assets and these need exploiting. We are only 1 and a half hours from London by train, we have a Motorway network close by, we have magnificent countryside and heritage sites on our doorstep, our schools have greatly improved, people want to live and work in Retford - Retford is a lovely place to live but we need to promote it properly with improved Employment and Residential Sites, no more flats required! Ordsall appears to have been over developed already due to its distance from the town centre, and that of course is the engine of any town, the centre.
267	3	Site 46 and 309 are very attractive sites for Residential Development. Access to Schools and Employment points to the North side of Retford as being ideal for future development.
267	4	Site 7 looks a little large and is agricultural land, and a possible nature conservation site, with public footpaths crossing it.
267	5	Sites 37 and 512 although situated in the right quarter of Retford will only impact on the problems that already exist on Tiln Lane.
267	6	Sites 46 and 309 would have a minimal adverse affect to the current area and are compatible with the existing area.
267	7	Sites 51 and R7 do fit in with the current scheme in Retford but any other large industrial sites would require a major rethink of the roads. The option of completely changing the North East of Retford to bypassing Welham and its bridges to the West would open up the North East corner of Retford to both Employment and Residential use and a new junior school.
267	8	Site R7 to the west of North Road would have a huge impact on the already busy North Road, a small residential extension to the estate of houses already institute should not cause too many problems but traffic lights or a mini roundabout must be installed at the Primary Care Centre to alleviate the already dangerous situation when leaving the centre.
267	9	Site R2 has no access that is suitable.
267	10	Option A
267	11	Definitely concentrated around existing sites. To have Gypsy sites scattered around the district would be detrimental to Bassetlaw.
267	12	These should be provided together so as to alleviate any conflict that may come from differentiating transit and residential travellers.
268	1	Unsure
268	2	No I think there are enough houses in Worksop already as in that current supply outstrips demand - looking at the number of houses available for sale. Also it is difficult to obtain mortgages on new build houses due increased deposit lenders require for new build homes and the majority of potential homeowners do not have large deposits. Therefore I foresee large numbers of empty or half complete properties which would in turn cause other issues.
268	3	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
268	4	I would be in favour of the employment sites but not on location 35 as it is a rural location near residential properties.
268	5	I do not support mixed use sites.
268	6	Yes
268	7	None
268	8	Land for employment only and any location not near residential homes or which would destroy woods, hedgerows, public footpaths/ bridleways.
268	9	Option A
268	10	No
268	11	Together
268	12	None
269	1	On the whole yes
269	2	Although I disagree with the division of the grades between amber and red in Criterion 4, loss of agricultural land. Criterion 3a has been discounted due to the information being unavailable. and all grade 3 considered only amber. I would expect that this would mean more agricultural land being included in the LDF rather than excluded. If any land deemed grade 3 was to be considered for development that the extra work needed to determine if it was 3a or 3 b should then be done, and the PPS be followed.
269	3	All towns need to grow their economies, however this needs to be balanced with their 'ambience'. Retford is a rural market town, and so any expansion in housing provision is likely to consume green space, therefor being deleterious to its raison d'être I would say half of what is proposed, i.e. 250 houses would be sufficient.
269	4	Sites; 27, 70, 10, 342, 6, and 71 would add up to around 250 homes and not greatly extend into current agricultural land.
269	5	44 and 24
269	6	I do not agree that the 51/571/572/R7 site should be considered mixed or designated as a whole. I would support development on the East side of the north road adjacent to Randall Way to complete that area as a source of employment opportunities. On the west side of the North Road some expansion of the North Road estate could be contemplated but only to bring it in line with Randall Way, i.e. not extending further along the north road.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
269	7	I don't agree that site 41, 53 and 364 should be considered for either housing or employment as this is extending the town into agricultural land.
269	8	As you can tell I am very keen on maintaining the rural approaches to our lovely market town. I work in Sheffield and delight in returning to my home town and telling my work colleagues of the advantages of living in a small town where you are able to walk 10 minutes either way and be either accessing its shops and amenities, or out in the countryside enjoying views of fields and occasional sightings of wildlife. Any expansion like that proposed for housing around Tiln Lane (512&37), end of Bigsby road and Park Lane (533, 7, 46 & 309) as well as those in the south or Retford and Ordsall, would have such deleterious effects on our existing green belt that the whole character of the town would be altered. Not to mention the overloading of such problematic road junctions such as Tiln Lane/Moorgate, Ordsall Road/Babworth roundabout, and the bridge at Ordsall.
269	9	Yes, well maintained open spaces in any town are vital to community health and cohesion
269	10	No
269	11	Option A
269	12	Existing sites, as these have in principle gained acceptance and therefor it would be less controversial than creating a new site.
269	13	Don't know
269	14	None known
270	1	I think location 35 is completely unsuitable for further housing development. Additional housing will take away the countryside feel of Gateford Park. Up to 700 new houses will cause untold extra congestion, on an already busy estate
270	2	Option A
270	3	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35. This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.
270	4	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
270	5	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
270	6	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
270	7	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
270	8	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
270	9	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
270	10	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
270	11	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
271	1	No building of any kind on Section 35.
271	2	No further development for houses is required as there is no demand for new build houses as there are already 96 properties for sale within only one mile of my post code, S81 7RX which have been on the market for a long time. Some as long as 3 to 4 years. In addition it is difficult to obtain mortgages for new build houses due to the increased levels of deposit that lenders now require, therefore this would make it difficult to sell 700 houses especially in this climate.
271	3	Location 35 is unsuitable.
271	4	Any as long as it is not near to houses.
271	5	None. No mixed use sites.
271	6	Yes
271	7	Yes, Building on section 35 will destroy hedgerows and trees having an impact on wildlife.
271	8	It will also create a significant amount of traffic generation causing serious congestion to the residential roads in this area, especially at rush hour times. It takes 10 to 15 minutes in a morning to pull out of the junction at Ashes Park on to Gateford Road at the moment.
271	9	There will also be increased pollution, destruction of beautiful countryside and construction road damage.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
271	10	If this question relates to our feedback given, I feel feedback from residents in this area is imperative as it is the residents of this area that this property development will have a huge impact on our daily lives as well as the environment and wildlife.
271	11	Option A
271	12	No
271	13	No transit near to housing. Too much congestion and pollution.
271	14	None
272	1	Don't understand the question.
272	2	I think the housing is ample in Worksop and the area can't sustain another large housing project. We do not have the public services, schools, etc. to support more residents in this area. The traffic congestion will be unbearable on certain estates, especially entering and exiting the estate where I live.
272	3	I think location 35 is totally unsuitable for numerous reasons.
272	4	I have no opinion in relation to this.
272	5	I have no opinion in relation to this.
272	6	Yes
272	7	I feel that Bassetlaw council have not publicised this enough and the only reason I found out about it was by chance. These proposed sites will have a massive impact on local residents and a letter from Bassetlaw council should have been sent to all local residents who it may effect.
272	8	Option A
272	9	The sites should be in and around existing sites and not in new locations.
272	10	Don't know what it means
272	11	None
273	1	Yes
273	2	No, in the current global financial climate I do not believe there is a need for more housing. There are plenty of houses for sale in a wide range of price brackets that are not selling - more new houses will provide a surplus and devalue property and the area.
273	3	Worksop needs more local employment but I doubt it will come.
273	4	I strongly disagree with the 2 largest sites - No 4 and 35. They are of incredible size compared to existing developments and I think the negative impact of sites of this size is too easy to underestimate.
273	5	Site No 35 in Gateford will place a massive stress on local infrastructure. Peak time traffic is a long-standing problem.
273	6	The schools are already failing to accommodate the current population.
273	7	Part of the beauty of this area is its rural feel and wildlife which will be completely removed by such an expansive development.
273	8	Yes, they should be protected. They add to the attractiveness of the area.
273	9	Option A
274	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
274	2	I agree that the village of Misson would be able to accommodate a maximum of 18 new properties provided they were to be located within the existing village boundary.
274	3	Site ref: 480 Misson Mill site would be the preferred option for new build as it is a brownfield site and would not impose any current boundary restrictions, services such as sewage, electricity etc. are currently in place and the site readily up for sale for development.
274	4	The location of this site would allow access into the village without increasing traffic through the remainder of the village. The amount of traffic through the village is very important to me as a resident as the local school and village green boarder the main road through Misson and this is the only area local children have access to.
274	5	Areas highlighted as potential housing which is currently green belt land and outside of the original village boundary ref: 504 / 505 / 506 / 383 should be protected from future development as there is a suitable alternative within the village, it has never been built on and holds no current infrastructure for housing.
274	6	I believe Gypsy and traveller sites should be concentrated in existing sites, again it comes down to the small infrastructure of the village, also the report states that the Gypsy sites already present in the area are not fully allocated, therefore provision should be sufficient without providing more pitches in a small village.
275	1	Yes, we agree that sufficient land should be allocated within Walkeringham to accommodate all housing needs, including specialist provision (see attached statement).
275	2	Site 445 offers scope to accommodate the sensibly managed growth of Walkeringham in a manner which benefits the village (see attached statement).
275	3	Criterion 1: At this early stage, no consultation has taken place with the community in relation to the site or any proposals for its development. However, in examining options for its potential development for housing, consideration has been given to the priorities and needs of the residents of Walkeringham as identified within Site Allocations and Options Consultation Paper. The site is of a large enough size to ensure that a scheme is developed that meets as many of these aspirations as possible and therefore, as illustrated in the Development Framework we are able to include resources such as public open space and a children's play area, as well as a mix of housing that responds to locally-identified need, such as bungalows and sheltered accommodation for older people in addition to family housing. (GREEN)

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
275	4	Criterion 2: As set out within the Site Appraisal in section 2, the existing use on the site is agriculture and therefore Greenfield. There are no issues or costs related to remediation to recover the site from any previous users In relation to neighbouring land uses, as set out within Section 2, sites on both sides of the proposed housing site are in residential use. Therefore this would be compatible with the site's allocation for (GREEN)
275	5	Criterion 3: Whilst it is not proposed to deliver uses other than residential on the site at this stage, the inclusion of housing units targeted at older people could also lead to related development, if appropriate, in the future of a care home on the site. If this were to take place, then a number of jobs would be created as a result. (AMBER)
275	6	Criterion 4: As illustrated in section 2 of this report, the site is currently in use as Grade 3 agricultural land. Whilst its development would result in the loss of this site for agriculture, all of Walkeringham and much its hinterland is also classified as Grade 3 agricultural land and therefore alternative sites may be available nearby of an equal quality. (AMBER)
275	7	Criterion 5: The Environment Agency does not identify any Groundwater Protection Zones within Walkeringham. (AMBER)
275	8	Criterion 6: Please see Section 3 which contains a detailed consideration of the local landscape features through the Landscape Value and Impact Assessment which includes an analysis of the Nottinghamshire landscape Character Assessment. The outcomes of this assessment reveal not only that the site is within a 'create' Landscape Character Zone, but also that its proposed development would present an opportunity to proactively apply the policy. (GREEN)
275	9	Criterion 7: The Development Framework set out in Section 4 outlines the detailed consideration undertaken in preparing an indicative layout for the site. It reflects local patterns of development and it is proposed to utilise materials that are sympathetic to the character of the village. This approach will ensure that the built character is reinforced. (GREEN)
275	10	Criterion 8: The Bassetlaw District Council Green infrastructure Study, May 2010 illustrates that there are no formally identified Green infrastructure features on or close to the site (or in Walkeringham more widely). Whilst the River Trent and Chesterfield Canal corridors pass the village to the east, west and north, these do not directly pass through. There is a minor node also to the west of the village but this does not have a direct relationship to the site which is to the south east. Whilst the Green infrastructure Plan does not formally identify any specific features within Walkeringham, this does not mean that these do not exist. Green infrastructure is defined as: "networks of multi-functional open space, at all scales" and may include: Woodland; Watercourses; Playing fields; Nature reserves; Cemeteries; Footpaths; Hedgerows; Amenity landscaping. Walkeringham is characterised not only by its built form but also by the areas of open space that are located across the village. Whilst not always accessible to the public, these open areas are an important feature of the local environment. The proposed development concept suggests a scheme that recognises the importance of the green character of the site and the village. It works with the existing landscaping and proposes to locate development in a green environment in a form that relates both to the existing development on Station Road as well as a new public open space in the centre of the site. The design of the scheme incorporates a looped footpath around the open space to maximise its accessibility and to encourage both existing and new residents of Walkeringham to use the space. (GREEN)
275	11	Criterion 9: The Bassetlaw District Council Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, October 2011 considers the site to be developable. It states that the site is suitable with no known constraints. In addition, the SHLAA states that the site is achievable with market factors being supportive of sites of this size and no exceptional cost factors likely to be incurred when developing the site. In relation to suitability, the SHLAA notes that the site may be available subject to it being either allocated for housing development or being granted planning permission -there are no land ownership constraints and the landowner is keen to work with the Council to deliver housing on the site within the appropriate timescale. Specific matters to be considered at a detailed design stage, should the site be allocated for housing, are noted to include: Ensuring that highway requirements can be met. In addition, issues relating to the site's surroundings that are a factor to consider in its development are noted as: Land to the west of the site is identified as an area of archaeological interest; One local listed building (heritage asset) has been identified to the southwest of the site. (GREEN)
275	12	Site is characterised by mature trees which are an important characteristic of the village. The development of this site could result in the loss of these important landscape features.
275	13	In addition the site is located in a prominent position and can be viewed when approaching the village from the west.
275	14	Site forms part of the setting of a listed building and therefore its development could have adverse effects on this relationship. As you enter the village from the south, the main view to the west is towards the listed building and its grounds. Therefore to develop this site could affect this attractive local view.
275	15	The southern route into Walkeringham has a strong rural character influenced by the landscape beyond. To develop in this location could change the character of this local gateway.
275	16	The site contains many mature trees which are protected, therefore the actual developable area may be smaller than it appears on the SHLAA map.
275	17	Topography of the area, particularly when approaching from the A161 along Baulk Road means that the site is highly visible from the highway.
275	18	Site is isolated and not adjacent to any of the existing built form.
275	19	Plot is surrounded by buildings so any design and layout will need to be carefully undertaken to minimise overlooking issues if the site were to be developed.
275	20	Potential access point may need to pass by a historic building.
275	21	Local concerns over traffic particularly around school opening/closing times. Main access if the site were developed would be opposite the school and may therefore have significant impact on congestion.
275	22	Area badly affected by flooding in 2007.
275	23	Previously expressed local opposition.
275	24	Site is only large enough to deliver part of the proposed allocation.
275	25	The site is located in the outskirts of the village on the southern approach. This route is characterised by the rural character beyond the village with views toward the church and other listed buildings. Development at a higher density on the site would have a significant impact on these characteristics.
275	26	Whilst the adjacent site is in residential use, this is located on the opposite side on the garden and therefore the site is surrounded by open space

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Response number	Comment	
275	27	Site is in a prominent location at the gateway to the village when approaching the south.
275	28	May be issues with access onto the A161.
275	29	Site is away from the main built form of the village.
275	30	Access from the A161 may be difficult.
275	31	The site is surrounded by open countryside and is visible from the public footpath to the north of the village. Long views outwards towards the open countryside form the site's frontage.
275	32	The northern side of North Moor Road is characterised by lower density development which is punctuated with views through the housing to the countryside beyond.
275	33	Area badly affected by flooding in 2007
275	34	Part of the site surrounded by open countryside
275	35	Site is visible from the public footpath to the north of the village and also when approaching the site from North Moor Road
275	36	Area badly affected by flooding in 2007
275	37	Access from the A161 would be via an already difficult junction. Access via Station Road is to the area of the village where densities are lower and it is not possible to develop on the frontage in a sympathetic way.
275	38	Site is located on a view corridor out of the village to the open countryside beyond.
275	39	site is only large enough to deliver part of the proposed allocation.
275	40	The proposed development would deliver not only an appropriate amount of development in terms of numbers; it would also provide a number of broader, locally identified resources: A mix of housing types suitable for both families and older people; Public open space incorporating an equipped children's' play area; Sheltered housing for older people within warden controlled accommodation.
275	41	In addition, the proposed development would deliver additional benefits, which include: On-site affordable housing; Buildings which are designed to a high environmental standard -aiming for Code for Sustainable Homes level 5; Sympathetically designed buildings which retain the rural feel of the village and reflect local materials and character.
275	42	Finally, when considering alternative sites within the village, this plot on the south of Station Road appears to be the only opportunity to deliver Walkeringham's future housing in an appropriate way on an unconstrained site to an exceptional standard without compromising the character of the village. It also offers an opportunity for significant wider benefits for the local community.
276	1	I wish to lodge my objections to the building of housing, or any other building, on potential housing site reference 7 in Retford as per page 38, fig 5.1, in the report dated November 2011, Site Allocations, Issues And Options Consultation. My objection is based on the below points.
276	2	Traffic down Bigsby road is already down to a single lane due to all the parked cars on the road, extra traffic down this road would cause a big increase in the risk of an accident as lots of children are around this area going to and from the school.
276	3	The junction of Tiln Lane and the A620 would become even busier and cause more trouble down Tiln Lane which is already considering a Traffic Calming project, this development would hence be counter-productive to this
276	4	Loss of willow trees and hedges which currently support a lot of nature due to its protective area away from traffic and other hazards and its close proximity to water.
276	5	The land is currently commercially active producing Willow generating income for a local producer, and thus bringing in income to Retford
276	6	The local school would struggle to admit extra students without a negative impact on the service they provide. There are other newer schools around Retford which would be able to cope much better.
276	7	There are plenty of Brown field areas in and around Retford which could be developed rather than changing the current local Planning Policy boundaries.
276	8	There is a risk that building on this site would create a new risk of flooding area as a nearby area is already at risk of flooding and changing this landscape to tarmac from trees and hedges, which hold the land together and absorb the water, would create an increase in the amount of surface water around.
277	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable due to significant increase in traffic entering the Gateford area, many more cars means danger to children
277	2	Strain on schools and services
277	3	More traffic at local shops
277	4	Ruined views and privacy for many home owners
277	5	Construction road damage
277	6	Years of mess
277	7	Destruction of valuable agricultural land.
277	8	If the proposed development of site 35 went ahead I would move out of the area.
278	1	Yes, we agree with the methodology
278	2	Option A
278	3	Yes there is plenty of room for at least 15 new houses in the village
278	4	165 and 164 make the most sense to see development.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
278	5	Yes, all green areas should be protected.
278	6	Around existing sites
278	7	Together.
279	1	Option A
279	2	There is room in the village for development over the next fifteen years of more than 11 houses, with room for up to 100 houses over the full spectrum of houses for first time buyers to retirement friendly housing. This needs to be supported by appropriate facilities in the village such as a shop and a permanent Post Office.
279	3	I have no objections to any of the sites identified, providing transport systems and facilities are improved to support any development (which can be a condition of planning)
279	4	508 could be development for retirement homes as it is a level field with easy access to the roads. Currently it is not viable for agricultural purposes and is commonly used by surrounding householders to illegally dump their household waste.
279	5	I would favour developing open spaces rather than houses being developed on existing gardens. This seems to unnecessarily clutter up the village.
279	6	Different types of housing should be developed rather than the redbrick and tile variety which could artificially fossilise the look of the village.
279	7	Keeping open spaces protected from future development is meaningless if development is merely allowed to take place on people's gardens. This merely clutters up the village and renders the conservation area and any guidelines for the core of the village academic; guidelines that can be ignored whenever anyone wants to develop any part of their land.
279	8	Yes, but I am not sure they would be welcome.
280	1	We believe that, given the significant housing developments that have taken place in recent years between Greenway and the Riddell Arms along the east side of the A60 together with the large housing development now planned to be built in the former Firbeck Colliery Yard, there should be only very limited further growth in housing in Carlton in Lindrick and Langold during the next 16 years.
280	2	Future new housing should be limited to very small areas of infill housing within land already designated for housing development
280	3	Your question correctly asserts that there is no need to allocate further growth. In our view, there is a need not to allocate land for future growth. We expand further on our reasons for this in our answer to Question 23
280	4	Having studied the areas outlined for Potential Housing in Langold and Carlton in Lindrick, we are very concerned about the impact that housing development in these areas would undoubtedly have on the villages. The issues on which this concern is based are:
280	5	Scale of Development: The areas under consideration in both villages are very large compared to the existing size of the villages. Already the expansion of housing in Carlton in Lindrick and Costhorpe has already severely damaged the 'village' aspect of life here. The large housing development planned for the former Firbeck Colliery site can only exacerbate this
280	6	At the consultation meeting in November we learned that the numbers of houses proposed for the various sites under consideration for Potential Housing (LIST OF SITE CAPACITIES GIVEN) These proposed numbers of houses are disproportionate to the size of the villages. We believe there is no need for developments of this scale
280	7	The villages have amenities that are already stretched and currently most residents are travelling outside the villages for shopping, doctors and dentists. This is not a desirable situation and could only worsen if these developments were pursued further diminishing quality of life and social cohesion
280	8	The development plan does not appear to be bringing new jobs to the villages so their current function as dormitory villages for people working in Sheffield, Doncaster and Worksop will not be improved
280	9	Local primary and junior schools are barely sufficient for existing numbers and there appears to be no additional provision for additional schools or recreational and play areas
280	10	The A60 has become a busy road. Although the traffic calming islands have helped in reducing speed, the volume of traffic continues to grow. The road is busy from 6 am right through the day. Residents find it increasingly difficult to access the road during peak periods. The new development at Firbeck will, again, make this worse. Further developments would make the road busier and also increase the number of necessary access points.
280	11	The potential developments would result in a loss of landscape for existing residents. The large potential housing development areas would also mean that new residents would mostly not have views of the surrounding countryside.
280	12	There would be an impact on the environment and on biodiversity. As an example, if the Area 176 were developed, a valuable winter site for Lapwings, already becoming a rare sight in the north of the county, would be lost
280	13	In summary, we believe that future new housing should be limited to very small areas of infill housing within land already designated for housing development
280	14	We believe that the entire area around Langold Lake shown in light green on the planning map should become, Protected Open Space rather than Potential Protected Open Space. The area represents a leisure amenity for the residents of Carlton and Lindrick and Langold that is unique in the immediate area and is a logical extension of the existing Langold Country Park. The area abounds with wildlife and is rich in fauna and flora, many species of which are already becoming less common in the area.
280	15	In addition, we believe that the former Firbeck pit tip and the land connecting it to Langold Country Park should also become Protected Open Space. This is already an important area for recreational activities such as walking and playing. Again, this is an area rich in wildlife -plants, birds and insects. As an example, we can mention a sighting during 2011 of the Brown Argus butterfly, the first time we have seen this in Carlton in Lindrick in the 40 years we have lived here (we are members of Butterfly Conservation and were previously Recorder and Treasurer respectively of that organisation for the Yorkshire Region).

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
280	16	We are concerned that the building on the area already planned for housing comprising the former colliery yard (Costhorpe Industrial Estate) may have a negative impact on the Unprotected Open land adjacent to it. This makes it all the more important to protect this area
280	17	In support of the need to encourage biodiversity in this particular area we quote from the Nottinghamshire County Council Biodiversity website that the County's 'biodiversity resource is significantly reduced from what it was in the recent past. The percentage of the county designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest is significantly lower than both national and regional averages:
280	18	In Nottinghamshire as a whole we have lost 97% of flower rich meadows since the 1930's and 90% of healthcare since the 1920's
280	19	As a partner of the Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Action Group, Bassetlaw District Council has a responsibility to deliver actions for biodiversity features of local importance
280	20	It is well established that a key to sustaining and increasing biodiversity is to create interconnected corridors of woodland and pasture that can support a wide range of wildlife. We believe the protection of the land around Langold Lake and the pit tip as Open Space would be a very valuable step in maintaining a wildlife corridor.
280	21	Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
281	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
281	2	No, this was based on Corner Farm being the recognised developed area.
281	3	No new dwellings should be allocated as there has been enough development of the village over recent years.
281	4	The village already floods in two areas every time we have heavy rain as the drainage system cannot cope.
281	5	We do not want any additional traffic coming through the village. answered above - permission to build was granted prior to the consultation meeting which incidentally was a farce as the presentation was finished before many of the residents attended It was not stated anywhere that the presentation would be at 3 30 and we could not get there until 5 pm in any case. It should have been repeated and then they did not have enough forms to hand out - many people had to request or travel to Worksop for the forms which should not have had to happen
281	6	No sites
281	7	Existing sites would be most sensible
281	8	Don't know
281	9	Don't know of any land
282	1	Yes
282	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
282	3	Yes, some for older people too.
282	4	228 is the best site for housing
282	5	All should be protected
283	1	I would like to raise my objection to the proposed potential future Developments of the sites adjacent to Bracken Lane, Grove Coach Road and Cavendish Road. Potential housing site Reference numbers 370 and 511, as identified in the Bassetlaw District Local Development Framework, Site allocations, Issues and Options Consultation Document.
283	2	I believe that the sites listed above would be unsuitable for future development for a number of reasons, these being. Traffic generation, access and road safety:- Access on to London Road from Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane is currently problematic with the current amount of traffic this would only get worse with the increased development. With the difficulty exiting on to London Road this would lead to Traffic using Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road to Grove Lane all single vehicle width and hence unsuitable for the increased amount of traffic.
283	3	Risk of Flooding:- During the recent floods of 2007 a number of properties in the area suffered from flooding. This was due to the amount of surface water draining from the adjacent hills. The sites 370 and 511 reduced the risks to adjacent properties by acting as a buffer for the water to collect before being drained away. Development of this site would require the site to be raised to prevent the proposed new developments from flooding thus greatly increasing the risk to existing properties adjacent to the sites.
283	4	Inadequate infrastructure:- The proposed sites are situated at the very edge of the town so are some distance from local amenities. The nearest convenience stores, to the proposed developments are 1Mile away and the main shopping centre of Retford some 1.5miles. This once again will lead to an unsafe amount of traffic using the local roads. The local school for the area, Bracken Lane Primary School is a small school that is currently over subscribed and would not be able to accommodate a large influx of additional children
283	5	Density, layout and design of proposed development:- The existing properties in the surrounding area adjacent to the proposed sites are all detached properties with ample parking. With the density per acre far less than the 30 houses per acre proposed. This would be totally out of keeping with the surrounding area
283	6	Loss of Trees or Hedgerows The proposed sites are surrounded with hedgerow that is home to many species of bird's, animals and insects. Any future development of the sites would put at risk biodiversity of the area.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
283	7	I'm writing in response to your letter dated 17th January 2012, regards the proposed future development sites 3, 370, 511, 488 and 489. My property is indeed adjacent to the proposed sites and I feel the sites are totally unsuitable for further development for the following reasons. a) a. Road safety, traffic generation and difficulty of access. The hazardous access to London Road from Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane is already very difficult with the current volume of traffic. Additional housing and the consequential increase in the traffic seeking to enter London Road would exacerbate this problem and would lead to road users using Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road to access Retford via Grove Lane. These lanes are all single vehicle width and hence unsuitable for the increased amount of traffic. These roads are also used by children walking to and from Bracken Lane School. Any increase in traffic would pose a greater danger to these children.
283	8	b) Risk of flooding. During the recent floods of 2007 a number of properties in the area were flooded by surface water draining from the adjacent hills. At that time the situation was largely contained as sites 370 and 511 reduced the risks to adjacent properties by acting as a buffer zone, allowing water to collect in the fields before slowly draining away. Any development of these two sites would replace the slow draining fields with a significant amount of hard surface which would increase the amount of surface run off both in speed and quantity thereby placing adjacent properties at greater risk of flooding. Any raising of the sites to protect the new properties would also greatly increase the risk to existing properties adjacent to the sites.
283	9	Inadequate infrastructure. The proposed sites are situated at the very edge of Retford and are therefore at some distance from local amenities. From the proposed development it is one mile to the nearest convenience store and some one and a half miles to the main shopping and commercial area in the town centre. The proposal to build affordable housing so far from shops and other amenities will lead to a dangerous increase of pedestrian and motorised traffic on narrow local roads.
283	10	The local school for the area, Bracken Lane Primary School is currently over subscribed and would not be able to accommodate the large influx of additional children which the proposed development would generate.
283	11	c) Density, layout and design of proposed development. Existing properties in the area adjacent to the proposed sites are all detached properties with ample parking. The housing density per acre is far less than the 30 houses per acre proposed which would make the new development totally out of keeping with its surroundings.
283	12	d) Loss of Trees or Hedgerows. The proposed sites are surrounded by hedgerows which are home to many species of birds, animals and insects. Any future development of the sites would put at risk the biodiversity of the area.
284	1	I am writing to raise my concerns over the plans to build new housing in Clarbrough on two sites listed as 170 and 258 in the Bassetlaw district local development framework document
284	2	I have been a resident on the road adjoining these two sites for over forty years (since the development was built) and have seen traffic through the village dramatically increase during that time. This has been of particular concern with the main road into Retford regularly being blocked by trucks failing to follow the approved route and becoming trapped at the low railway bridge
284	3	Local amenities are now almost non existent in the village. The local shop, post office and petrol station have all closed, meaning a trip of three miles into Retford for any essentials. This becomes very difficult for those without transport as the bus services outside of those for school children are very sparse.
284	4	During the snow of winter 2010 I was trapped in my home for three weeks as the side roads in Clarbrough received no clearance or gritting. Your plans would mean that the small lane servicing our estate would be the main thoroughfare to and from the new development.
284	5	Telephone services to the village are poor with low quality lines and some of the slowest broadband services in the country. Increasing the number of homes using the services will only make the situation worse
284	6	In recent years the infant and primary school have been amalgamated into one smaller establishment. This school is presently at full capacity. Increasing the number of homes in the village would presumably mean increasing the number of children requiring schooling.
284	7	Site 170 Your own document states that this area is a Site of Special Scientific Interest. It is also a flood plain. Building here not only would mean that homes were in danger of flooding, but that the drain off from adjoining areas would be affected, increasing their own risk of flood damage. Your document also states that there is open countryside to the West, but does not mention the proposal to build further properties there (Site 258). What your document does not say is that this site is designated as a Site of importance for Nature Conservation (although it does mention this in the information for site 258) surely this is something that should be flagged as these sites have legal protection.
284	8	Site 258 Again this is a Site of Special Scientific Interest and an area of flood risk. Building here not only risks flooding of the homes, but increases the risk of adjoining properties due to the loss of run off
284	9	Your document states that the site has 'good access'. I am amazed that you could consider access via a small lane at either end as good for this amount of properties
284	10	The document states that the area is wasteland with previous use unknown. As it has been rented out to a local farmer as a field for growing crops by the council for over forty years, I find this very hard to believe
284	11	Overall, these two sites are both Sites of Special Scientific Interest (one also designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation), on a flood plain, with difficult access and almost no amenities locally
285	1	Whilst I am aware that we cannot register a complaint against this proposed planning just because it will spoil the splendid views that I and my neighbours currently enjoy
285	2	enjoy I do feel that I need to register a complaint against this proposal based on the fact that we understand the development is for about 500 / 600 houses and should this register only 2 persons per household this would be an immediate increase of 1200 people

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
285	3	Based on the fact that this is only one of a number of proposals, a number of which may be successful, I would like to respectfully ask how the council are considering the employment of such large numbers? Retford is not a town that is booming and welcoming new industries to its ranks, in fact the opposite is happening in that we are seeing what were once our large prosperous industries within the town close down or move away to Doncaster. Like many residents of Retford we would welcome companies investing in the town which in turn would increase job opportunities and this in turn would promote the need for further residential properties being built
285	4	The farmland to the rear of our address has been farm land for many years and has never lain dormant?
285	5	It is not level land and rises to a substantial height which would suggest that when, or if, building took place on this land then a substantial amount of effort would have to be put in place to avoid flooding of the properties below them. You may be aware that this occurred in Welham when a housing development took place there and flooding now occurs annually at a cost to residents, council and insurance companies.
285	6	You may believe that I am what is commonly termed a NIMBY (not in my back yard) type of person? On the contrary I would welcome the building of further residential properties in Retford if I thought that it was needed on such a large scale or that the current infrastructure could cope with it
285	7	Ordsall is already very heavy with traffic first thing in the morning and whenever an accident occurs on the A1, which appears to be happening more regularly, then Ordsall can come to a complete standstill as the A1 traffic is inevitably diverted through the village.
286	1	Option A.
286	2	14 new houses
286	3	224 - 234 (part of), 537
286	4	Yes
286	5	REMOVED
286	6	REMOVED
286	7	Site 156 - already refused on the following: Overshadowing, overlooking or loss of privacy
286	8	Traffic generation
286	9	Loss of trees or hedgerows
286	10	Mass of buildings
286	11	Impact on private rights of way
286	12	Capacity of private drains
286	13	Site 516 - Private house and garden (spoil area) and access on to a very busy road (corner)
286	14	Site 157 - Private house and poor access, outside the village envelope.
287	1	Yes, I believe that sites 37 and 512 should be protected from further development.
287	2	Initial concerns include the preservation of wildlife, especially barn owls. These being protected species, are currently in habitation in plots 37 and 512.
287	3	Concern for the loss of privacy and hedgerows.
287	4	The inadequate infrastructure to support both sites for potential housing.
287	5	Traffic generation and road safety - already a deep concern that Sheath Road and Tiln Lane are currently overused by HGVs, the increase in traffic would compromise road safety especially for local residents and children attending the local school.
287	6	Flood risk for residents on Bolham Lane.
287	7	Concerned about the appearance of modern housing developments in such a rural part of Retford.
288	1	I think that before any specific judgement is made on any future development it has to be put before the people of Blyth to decide.
288	2	Option A
288	3	I disagree with the amount of land being proposed in Blyth and think any development in future should take place in the existing development boundary.
288	4	As no proposed sites come within the development boundary the answer has got to be no development unless it is limited to within the boundary.
288	5	Some, or parts of the proposed sites, apart from being outside the development boundary are within the area of the floodplain that has over recent years been under three feet of water at times. Drainage and other services would be a considerable issue.
288	6	Also, there is the closeness of the A1 trunk road to all the proposed sites, bar one, maybe two. This road, at some point in the future, is going to need upgrading from a four to six lane motorway. Property was compulsory purchased a few years ago for this purpose but then was resold as the idea was shelved. But?
288	7	I think all open spaces should be protected, I don't think there is enough open space.
288	8	I suggest one of the proposed sites (possibly 213) become a proper football field with changing facilities and parking.
288	9	Tricky question. How many pitches, site at Daneshill Rd could be extended, we're talking oil and water here.
289	1	I would like to see this plot developed (Site 114)
289	2	Its close proximity to the village centre will ensure a strong market for them

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Response number	Comment	
289	3	The size of the plot would suit a small family development extremely well.
290	1	Having more housing in the village will bring more families, increase business to the village, which will improve the village community.
290	2	50 new houses.
290	3	I would prefer smaller sites to be developed, especially site 114.
290	4	Currently, this site (114) is an eyesore as you enter/exit the village, by developing this site it will 'finish' the village.
290	5	There is already a housing estate opposite, so it will blend in and the site isn't too big
290	6	It would be good to have good quality, affordable family housing
291	1	Regarding Plot 8 access - Hemmingfield Rise. You already have a petition on file from the residents of Hemmingfield Rise regarding access into the top field via 20A Hemmingfield Rise, which gives details of objections. This was handed in to the planning department and I was told at the time it would be held for future developments. The petition was signed by everyone on the estate available at the time and suggests there is no community support for the development of the site.
291	2	The roads leading up to the proposed access are not suitable. Hemmingfield Crescent is a busy road with cars parked on both sides of the street at certain times. It already caters for Hemmingfield Rise, Hemmingfield Close and Hemmingfield Way.
291	3	We are under the impression that the highways department would not grant any further roads of access on to the junction of Hemmingfield Rise - Hemmingfield Crescent, hence Hemmingfield Way being a cul-de-sac.
291	4	I am also concerned about protected species as there are bats in the area.
291	5	Would suggest that plot 8 is not an option and that you look further afield to the A57 corridor as an option that would be more suitable to the majority.
292	1	Regarding Plot 8 access - Hemmingfield Rise. You already have a petition on file from the residents of Hemmingfield Rise regarding access into the top field via 20A Hemmingfield Rise, which gives details of objections. This was handed in to the planning department and I was told at the time it would be held for future developments. The petition was signed by everyone on the estate available at the time and suggests there is no community support for the development of the site.
292	2	The roads leading up to the proposed access are not suitable. Hemmingfield Crescent is a busy road with cars parked on both sides of the street at certain times. It already caters for Hemmingfield Rise, Hemmingfield Close and Hemmingfield Way.
292	3	We are under the impression that the highways department would not grant any further roads of access on to the junction of Hemmingfield Rise - Hemmingfield Crescent, hence Hemmingfield Way being a cul-de-sac.
292	4	I am also concerned about protected species as there are bats in the area.
292	5	Would suggest that plot 8 is not an option and that you look further afield to the A57 corridor as an option that would be more suitable to the majority.
293	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
293	2	Yes
293	3	480 only
293	4	480 - max. 18 houses
293	5	Research, if not already done, needs to take place to access the desirability of purchasing a house in Misson. There are a number of properties on the market in Misson that have been so for many years, including what would be classed as affordable housing.
293	6	Yes, protected.
293	7	Yes - existing sites would appear to be the most straight forward option.
293	8	Unable to specify yes/no as don't know enough about the travelling community and what their preference would be.
293	9	No - unaware of suitable sites.
294	1	We think there should be more than 11 houses in the next 15 years. There should be 100 plus and other facilities such as a small supermarket or shop with a permanent Post Office and enlargement of the school to be able to take more students.
294	2	We believe there should be more affordable houses for first time buyers and retirement accommodation within the centre of the village - e.g. sites 109, 508 and 526.
294	3	No more infilling in gardens is needed, but small fields within the frame of the village - e.g. sites 108, 491, 523 and 525.
294	4	We agree that the highlighted spaces on the map to be protected, but the field on Old Hall Lane (508) would be ideal for retirement accommodation because of its situation in the centre of the village, so should be removed from the protected list.
295	1	Yes, provided it is small affordable housing or preferably council housing.
295	2	Certain sites should be protected from development. Site 536, adjacent to the village hall, should be kept as open space.
295	3	Sites 275, 276 and 452 should not be developed to protect Portland Place as a cul-de-sac.
295	4	The other sites 274, 281 and 299 would be preferable on the outskirts.
295	5	No
295	6	No development on open spaces please - these need to be protected and extended.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
295	7	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
295	8	Extend existing sites to develop community for gypsy and traveller children.
295	9	No opinion.
296	1	Having studied the proposals that have been put forward for the Local Development Framework, we feel strongly that sites 37 and 512 off Tiln Lane are not suitable for housing development for the following reasons: Historically this has always been agricultural land, indeed a greenfield site, and the adjacent land mirrors this, a large building development in this area would seriously detract from the existing green infrastructure.
296	2	There are already serious concerns with the access and egress of vehicles on to Tiln Lane and the amount of heavy goods traffic that use this route close by Carr Hill primary school. The blind bend from Tiln Lane onto Smeath Lane has been a blackspot for many years and local residents, supported by County and District Councillors, have long campaigned to reduce the amount of traffic utilising this route.
296	3	Bolham Lane that abuts site 37 provides a much used pedestrian route and walkway for pupils to the Elizabethan School at Hallcroft - it is not suitable for increased traffic . The lane already suffers from severe subsidence due to its close proximity to the River Idle and floodplain. This area historically used to be willow beds. In the past there has been a severe runoff of water on to Bolham Lane from the fields where building is proposed. If building were allowed this would only increase as there would be a much reduced intake of water in to the land due to the hard surfacing.
296	4	The main sewage pipe from hayton and Clarborough runs directly across the proposed site, down onto Bolham Lane pumping station and over many years has caused significant problems to local residents and Severn Trent. A major development on these sites would require a much increased capacity which the present system would be unlikely to accommodate.
296	5	A mains water pipe runs along Bolham Lane up into the field along the boundary of site 37, abutting our property. Again, there has been major pressure and burst problems with this old cast iron supply, which Anglian water can confirm, along with flooding this has contributed to the road's subsidence.
296	6	A mains electricity supply also runs across site 37 from badgers Chase to a transformer on the boundary of the proposed site.
296	7	The land on and adjacent to the proposed sites has extremely poor drainage and is liable to flooding, as seen with the severe runoff of water onto Bolham Lane in 2010.
296	8	A wildlife corridor runs through Retford along the River Idle, including site 37. It continues on to the Idle Valley Nature Reserve and SSSI.
296	9	There would appear to be significant lack of infrastructure, services, highways and schools within the area to support the proposed levels of growth.
296	10	We would strongly urge the planning department to look closely at any proposed development on these two greenfield sites that could impact so heavily on the local area and its character.
297	1	Palmer road - There are serious concerns regarding the increase of traffic, particularly as we see considerable congestion twice a day around Carr Hill school and any increase presents great danger to the children arriving at or leaving the school. We already see heavy lorries using Tiln Lane to avoid the low bridges at Welham. Traffic backs up along Tiln Lane so far it blocks access to Bigsby Road and Elmwood Close. Do we really want to add a potential 1000 cars to this congestion?
297	2	It cannot be right to develop land outside the borough boundary before using up the brownfield land.
297	3	This development would have a serious detrimental impact on this area , changing the whole character of this part of Retford.
297	4	With reference to criterion 4, There is clearly considerable impact on agricultural land in respect of sites 1, 46, 309, 37 and 512.
297	5	These sites are also likely to affect the character of the area which is a quiet residential area (ref criterion 6)
297	6	Reference is made to local road access and access to the wider road network. I have serious concerns for the above sites having an impact on the roads in this area particularly on Tiln Lane which at times is badly congested and blocks access to and from Bigsby Road and Elmwood Close.
297	7	Also there is a Primary school in the area and I have concerns over the safety of the children. Several hundred extra cars would be using these roads where we already have heavy lorries avoiding the low bridges at Welham.
298	1	At the present time I believe Clarborough/Hayton should be considered as dormitory villages with very little requirement for additional development.
298	2	The current application at Corner Farm is in excess of the proposed 12 properties for the area and it should be noted that underground services at the lowest part of Hayton are already under serious pressure at normal times and create flooding to properties in adverse weather occurrences.
298	3	There are already a number of planning applications lodged for individual development in Hayton, with potential for further infill properties to follow over the coming years.
298	4	The area is sadly lacking in facilities with the closure of shop and Post Office in Clarborough, and very little opportunity for employment in the close vicinity. If affordable housing is constructed to attract a younger population to the area.
298	5	Likewise the schooling facilities will need to be increased if a younger population is eventually attracted.
298	6	As an alternative to the development of Corner Farm, maybe thought should be given to the development of Celery Fields, Clarborough, which has the advantage of vehicular access from both Smeath Lane and Broad Gores, giving distinctly safer movement of traffic without the complex problems that will be created at Corner Farm.
299	1	We object in the strongest possible terms to the Council plans to develop sites 7, 46, 309 and 533 on the grounds of: No consultation with residents prior to the production of the proposal. The development will completely alter the character of the area.
299	2	Loss of habitat for wildlife, birds of prey, deer, foxes, rabbits, pheasant, partridge and many other small birds.
299	3	Loss of trees; willow which is harvested and many other trees which surround the site.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
299	4	Loss of good agricultural land.
299	5	This is a quiet residential area. The development will completely alter and destroy the area.
299	6	There will be a huge increase in traffic. Tiln Road is an already busy road. Lorries have to use this road to avoid the low bridge at Welham and would be turned in to an access road into the new development, massively increasing traffic.
299	7	Traffic would also increase to dangerously high levels along Palmer Road into Cornwall Road, onto Bigsby Road or Park Lane and Longholme Road, to Welham Road to avoid the busy Tiln Lane.
299	8	The danger to road users and pedestrians would be immense.
299	9	The already stretched services (Fire, Police, Hospitals/GPs) would not be able to cope The funding needed to increase these services would be massive.
299	10	The proposed areas involve building outside the existing development envelope/the borough boundary.
299	11	All brownfield sites should be developed for housing before developing the edge of town and beyond the borough boundary.
300	1	We agree that enough land should be made available for 12 new dwellings.
300	2	Our view would not change even though sites for 12 new dwellings would be met within this application for 19 dwellings.
300	3	We feel that future developments could be considered on sites 170 & 258.
300	4	Whilst we would not be opposed to further development on site 541 we are at a loss to see how this area could be considered for 14 dwellings.
300	5	The site length between existing plots is approximately 120 yards which would show that plot width would be approx. 9 yards and the depth is 50 yards. From this we feel that the maximum number of developments that should be considered for this location is four, if the existing access to the field is to be maintained.
300	6	Whilst you have made it clear in the document under 'What issues cannot normally be considered', that impact on private rights of way will not be considered when granting planning permission we feel, from our experience over the past 40 years of having a dwelling with access on to a private drive, that this needs to be considered from a point of view of future maintenance responsibilities. In granting planning permission, your authority needs to make this quite clear that in doing so the recipient must maintain the drive in front of their property to a defined standard.
300	7	We feel that the open spaces identified on the plan should be protected from any future development.
300	8	In connection with this we query why site 478, which covers a large open field and the Old Vicarage with possible development of two properties is not divided up into an open protected space - the field and a smaller development site for the two properties, which for access reasons we assume would be on ground currently part of the Old Vicarage grounds.
300	9	We think that new Gypsy/Traveller sites should be concentrated around existing locations to reduce the impact that these have on the area.
300	10	We feel that these sites should be provided together for the same reason as given above.
300	11	We are not aware of any sites in our area that would be suitable for development for this purpose.
300	12	Looking at the section 'What issues cannot normally be considered', we feel that it is unreasonable to not enter 'Loss of value of your own property' and that when granting planning permission consideration should be given to maintaining the character of the village and that many people have put quite an investment into their properties. One example of this would be to grant planning permission for 14 properties on site 541. This could only be achieved by allowing the development of a 2/3 storey terrace, which would be completely out of keeping with the character of the village. One think you have to take into account in your granting of planning permission is your duty to ensure that the proposed building is sympathetic to its surroundings.
301	1	I am writing to object to the proposals for development of fields to the north of Badgers Chase and to the north east of Palmer Road, either side of Tiln Lane on the north side of Retford.
301	2	My objection is mainly based on the change this would have on the character of the area in which I have lived since July 2000. We specifically bought our house because it backs on to agricultural land, which at the time was designated as green belt and therefore not eligible for future building.
301	3	Changing these agricultural fields into development areas would add great strain onto the existing infrastructure, specifically surface water drainage of the area along Tiln Lane which are both problems today
301	4	Also the fields to the rear of our property are at a higher elevation than our property and would therefore lead to us being overlooked and overshadowed by any new buildings.
301	5	It is my belief that there are many existing brownfield sites around the area that should be considered before the irrevocable loss of green belt land around the periphery of the town. Allowing planning permission for this land would be an abuse of the town's environment and character.
301	6	Traffic congestion along Tiln Lane
302	1	I am writing in respect of the proposed development of houses north of Badgers Chase, Retford and north of Palmer Road, Retford. I have lived for the past 15 years on Carr Hill Way which is situated just off Tiln Road. Living in the area for this amount of time has provided me with ample opportunity to become aware of the area and its surrounding streets. I strongly object to the above detailed developments for the following reasons:
302	2	The proposed developments will have a massive impact on the character of the area in which I live. I do not think this is acceptable.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
302	3	Tiln Road is already and extremely busy road. Vehicles regularly drive at great speed along this road, even during school hours. The road is constantly used by HGVs to avoid the low bridge at Welham. The same road also services Carr Hill Primary School. During peak times of the school opening and closing the traffic situation is utter chaos. parents park their vehicles on both sides of the road which obviously limits the road width and drivers' range of vision. My own feelings are that an accident is waiting to happen on that stretch of road. i believe the new developments will also have to, at some stage make use of Tiln Road. This will only augment the problem of traffic congestion in the area. With that in mind, traffic safety issues are my main concern. A child has recently been knocked down and killed on Tiln Lane. No noticeable improvements have been made to Tiln Lane since this tragic accident. Do we really need to increase traffic in this area as this obviously runs the risk of such a tragic accident happening again.
302	4	Being a resident of the area and a car driver, during peak times it is almost impossible to get off Tiln Lane and onto Moorgate due to the amount of traffic already using the road. Tiln Lane cannot safely take more traffic. Increasing the amount of traffic can only increase the chances of an accident occurring and increase the frustrations already encountered by local residents who use the road for vehicular access/egress.
302	5	The are suggested for the proposed developments is open countryside. How can we consider using such beautiful areas which are wildlife havens when so much within the town is left to decay and crying out for development.
302	6	I live within a stone's throw of the grassed area on Carr Hill Way. This grassed area was purpose built for the children on my estate to use. An increasing amount of children/teenagers use this area. However, most of them are not even connected to the estate but they congregate on this grassed area and in effect, take over it. This creates a number of issues, an increase in antisocial behaviour and the problem of children who do live on the estate not feeling safe to go and play on this area. An increase in the vicinity's population will, in my opinion, have a negative effect on the above mentioned areas. To increase the possible numbers of children, teenagers who could and would use it seems only likely to make things worse for the residents of Carr Hill Way and the estate within which it sits.
303	1	I am writing to voice my objections to the development of the around Badger's Chase etc. These are wonderfully quiet areas of good agricultural land and lovely views.
303	2	I believe these areas should be left as agricultural land and the emphasis should be placed on developing brownfield sites. Building on this land would completely destroy the character of the area.
303	3	There are, after all, two old school sites which could be developed and exist within the town residential envelopes.
303	4	Building in the Tiln Lane area would also considerably increase road traffic. Tiln Lane is already a busy road, which has difficulty in coping with heavy lorries that are diverted around Welham, further increasing the risk of accident to children at Carr Hill School.
303	5	Indeed, I would imagine that Carr Hill School would struggle to accommodate more children. The whole road infrastructure of the areas not suitable for further development, as it is already congested.
303	6	Then there is the economic argument. Who is going to buy these houses? There are already enough houses for sale in this area, nobody is buying.
304	1	I am writing to object to the proposals for development of fields to the north of Badgers Chase and to the north east of Palmer Road, either side of Tiln Lane on the north side of Retford.
304	2	My objection is mainly based on the change this would have on the character of the area in which I have lived since July 2000. We specifically bought our house because it backs on to agricultural land, which at the time was designated as green belt and therefore not eligible for future building.
304	3	Changing these agricultural fields into development areas would add great strain onto the existing infrastructure, specifically surface water drainage of the area along Tiln Lane which are both problems today
304	4	Also the fields to the rear of our property are at a higher elevation than our property and would therefore lead to us being overlooked and overshadowed by any new buildings.
304	5	It is my belief that there are many existing brownfield sites around the area that should be considered before the irrevocable loss of green belt land around the periphery of the town. Allowing planning permission for this land would be an abuse of the town's environment and character.
305	1	We write in response to the Council's LDF to raise objections and concerns about the proposed development adjacent to our property on Park Lane, Retford. Sites 7, 46, 309.
305	2	Firstly we would like to point out the adverse effect any such development will have on the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of noise, disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy and overshadowing.
305	3	The proposal will provide an unacceptably high density/overdevelopment of sites, especially if it involves the loss of garden/farmland or the open aspect of the neighbourhood.
305	4	We understand residents of The Drive have a covenant restricting development on the field in front of their houses (site 46) and would be interested to know how one resident is able to offer their property for local development without the backing of the remaining residents for the covenant to be removed?
305	5	Part of this site and the adjacent sites 7 and 309 are classed as being within flood zones 1 and 2, with site 309 being identified as a SSSI and site 46 being formerly identified as such. This has to be taken in to consideration as there are much more favourable sites for development. Indeed your own recommendations are that if plans were to incorporate these areas there may be more sequentially preferable sites.
305	6	The land in question is, in the main, open farmland, something that we are rapidly becoming short of in Retford and the surrounding villages, due to continued development. The visual impact, combined with the effect it will have on the character of this particular area is extremely detrimental.
305	7	The loss of existing views from neighbouring properties would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners.

Reference number		Answer
Responde nt	Comme nt	
305	8	Any development would adversely affect highway safety and the convenience of road users. Tiln Road is extremely dangerous and indeed in your own feedback from Retford future development questionnaires concern was raised on several occasions about the 'need to improve HGV traffic flow on Tiln Lane', ' traffic calming on Tiln Lane' and 'Tiln Lane cannot cope with the amount, size and speed of traffic'. If there is any development on such a massive scale no amount of measures will improve road safety due to the increased flow of traffic the development will generate. We have already had one fatality on this road. All HGV vehicles over 12'6" have to use Tiln Road due to the low bridge at Welham and this causes congestion at the junction with Moorgate Hill on a continual basis and this is combined with the increased traffic generated by parents of pupils at Carr Hill School. Any proposed development would exacerbate the existing problems of which neither can be remedied without either diverting HGV vehicles through Newark, to the south, or Bawtry, to the north (all roads between are restricted to non-HGV only) or closing down Carr Hill School, which raises the question "Where do you propose the children of the residents of the new developments are educated?". The cost implications of a proposed 'Welham Bypass' are unimaginable in this current economic climate, let alone the detriment this would cause to the surrounding area.
305	9	There are numerous sites that could and indeed have been redeveloped within Retford Town, without new developments that would increase the boundaries of Retford and be of great detriment to the adjacent neighbourhood, indeed the whole aspect of this historic market town. Oakdale Homes are currently developing land off Thrumpton Lane, housing has already been approved for land off Loading Road (formerly Barker's Nurseries), Bridon Place is being developed, there are sites on North Road (formerly St Giles School), proposals for redeveloping the former King Edward School site, new properties being built opposite the former Court House in Retford and further development of the Rector's Gate site in Hallcroft.
305	10	It would surely be more sensible to develop closer to major roads such as the A1 where traffic would not become so congested and not have to move through Retford which is already heavily congested.
306	1	As residents of Palmer Road, we strongly object to the proposed development of houses on land bordering Palmer Road etc.
306	2	This is good agricultural land, full of wildlife, deer, badgers, foxes, rabbits and loads of trees of interest to wild birds etc.
306	3	It will completely alter and destroy a quiet residential area.
306	4	New houses are not selling in the Retford area, there are many been empty for years.
306	5	There is no work in this area now and factories are closing, moving out. Where are jobs coming from for new houses?
306	6	Traffic increase will put more traffic on a very busy road - Tiln Lane. Lager lorries use Tiln Lane to avoid the low bridge at Welham. There is a primary school on this road which doesn't need any more traffic for road users and pedestrians. Its busy enough.
306	7	Services such as Police, Fire, Ambulance, hospitals, GPs etc. would not be able to cope. Where is the money coming from for extra facilities?
306	8	It is hard enough getting out of Tiln Lane or Longholme Road at peak times now. More traffic would make it very dangerous.
306	9	Houses that are empty now should be filled before new ones are built.
306	10	Money should be given to people to be able to purchase homes for first-time buyers, not put into more new homes on greenbelt land.
307	1	I would like to object against the plans because the access in the traffic will be triple and the roads aren't built for anymore.
307	2	Also the trees in this area make it one of the greenest still left in Retford. Protect the environment.
308	1	We would like to comment on possible building plans for site no. 520, land north of Carlton-in-Lindrick. Current use is agricultural land. We are totally opposed for all the reasons given on the website.
309	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
309	2	with reference to the meeting held at the village hall, no one was in favour of any further development or expansion. we, as a community are fully stretched with local amenities and services, including an over crowded school, and have no requirement for extra development. surely the multiple properties for sale could easily fill this niche. why build more and put a further strain on our resources?
309	3	as far as i was made aware corner farm development has been granted for 21 dwellings?
309	4	further development is neither required nor sustainable.
309	5	i consider the street lighting switch off to be incredibly dangerous and inconvenient. as a shift worker entering and leaving the village at all hours i find visibility ridiculously poor both on my well lit push bike and in my car. i also worry for my wife's safety in ecliptically conditions
309	6	secondly we are continually bombarded with over laden scrap metal merchants raiding our drives, gardens and yards. with the added bonus of zero street lighting surely it is a matter of time before this situation escalates into fully fledged burglaries?
309	7	all sites should be protected. redundant factory sites/former school grounds provide a more suitable alternative.
309	8	REMOVED
309	9	again why the requirement? it is their lifestyle choice.
309	10	none locally
310	1	No
310	2	I believe that location 35 is totally unsuitable but 4&w9 to be a better choice
310	3	W1
310	4	Option A

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
311	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable because the local school does not have the capacity for more children and it has no room to expand. Also there are no play facilities on the existing housing estate. Also the sheer number of extra cars this development may bring would exacerbate the present difficulties on getting out of the estate.
311	2	I believe sites 26,45,371,151 and 218 would be far more preferable for housing in the future as they could tie in with the proposed mixed sites close by.
311	3	Option A
312	1	A local referendum and significantly more advertising about what your plans are and why
312	2	You must be absolutely kidding unless you can build a first floor in the sky which directs all traffic out of Worksop then you need to look after what you have got first.
312	3	None
312	4	At this time and certainly for the next 10 years none, look after what you have got first.
312	5	None
312	6	Absolutely 1 zillion per cent they should
312	7	There is already a significant influx of people entering into Worksop which is not doing the town any favours there are already many thinking of leaving and the ones that will leave are not those that you want to.
312	8	My above comments should be suffice.
312	9	Option B: Focused in just one of the above towns
312	10	REMOVED
312	11	Not sure
312	12	Nottingham
312	13	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
312	14	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
312	15	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
312	16	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
312	17	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
312	18	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
312	19	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
312	20	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
313	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
313	2	Option A
314	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
314	2	no i strongly disagree with the above as i think our village is over-populated as it is with local school being overcrowded. I for one don't want to see my village turned into a town
314	3	we currently do not have a local shop and only have one public house
314	4	I also know for a fact that the proposed development site already has problematic drainage and therefore any extra properties would add to this problem.
314	5	NO
314	6	None we are over-developed as it is.
314	7	We would be concerned about the extra traffic coming down smeath "LANE" as it is already very heavily trafficked with L.G.V.s and local traffic. also as we live on smeath we notice the amount of traffic that passes through our village after dark which leads me onto the fact that we have our street lights turned off around midnight. As a driver that works unsocial hours i know how dark it is on smeath and can hardly see the parked cars if i have to turn my full beam off,(i feel it is an accident waiting to happen).
314	8	yes it should be protected as it is beautiful countryside
314	9	REMOVED
314	10	REMOVED
314	11	NO

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
315	1	definitely more employment because so many people leave Worksop each day to go to work.
315	2	I think location 35 is unsuitable because there is inadequate facilities for children on the estate at present - such as swings and roundabouts without going off the estate.
315	3	Access on and off the estate is dreadful and dangerous. For those people who drive to the M1 north the A57 is jammed at most times. I find it amazing that anyone who had any training in planning would have allowed the estate to grow as it has already without addressing the above problems let alone consider to increase the population and problems further.
315	4	There should be more employment in the areas of high unemployment
315	5	I believe housing and industrial sites should be kept separate
315	6	Yes I do we want this area to remain open and a place for leisure
315	7	People move here because of it's proximity to some lovely rural areas but with motorway access. Don't spoil it.
315	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
315	9	Around existing sites because that's where they have their families and roots
315	10	together - so their communities can remain together
316	1	Yes
316	2	Definitely more employment growth to address unemployment levels before considering housing growth
316	3	Site 35 does not have suitable infrastructure
316	4	W1, W12, W13
316	5	Broadband service in the town needs to be improved before adding further housing to the network.
316	6	Hospital should definitely be maintained to cover the expansion
316	7	Yes - Restaurants near the railway station with housing behind and then wildlife space behind.
316	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
317	1	Insufficient consideration has been given to the transport infrastructure in Worksop especially around the Gateford/Shireoaks area. There needs to significant investment in the road system before further large scale house building takes place.
317	2	More industrial development is required. Currently large numbers of people commute to work in Sheffield area causing congestion. Better rail links required or commuters
317	3	I believe that site 35 is unsuitable road system around Gateford is insufficient for current population there is significant congestion at peak times. There are only 2 exits from Gateford (Ashes Park Ave). Additional construction of hundreds of houses would cause more congestion and road hazard. What proposals are there to address this issue,) t would destroy woodland and public footpaths as well as efficient farm land at a time of increasing food prices and potential future shortages
317	4	Brownfield sites (old colliery sites etc.) and areas closer to the by pass
317	5	I have insufficient knowledge in this area
317	6	The open spaces on site 35 should be protected especially the woodlands.
317	7	The infrastructure of Worksop is insufficient to support significant housing development. Perhaps sites closer to the A1 should be considered first given that most people will be commuting to Sheffield/Nottingham areas.
317	8	Single Use
317	9	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
317	10	Existing sites
317	11	I have insufficient knowledge of council responsibilities.
317	12	None
317	13	The development will encroach on the dividing land and open space between Worksop, Wallingwells and Carlton-in-Lindrick contributing to urban sprawl and destroying public open space.
317	14	The area is productive agricultural land which is required for food production at a time of concern about future food production . This could also adversely impact upon the employment of agricultural workers and contractors.
317	15	Site 35 is bordered by Owday wood, Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is currently untouched by housing but significant disturbance would occur to these valuable woodlands by large scale housing development. The area known as Dog kennel Plantation and Gateford Hill is matured landscaped area and would also be lost to this proposed development
317	16	The public footpath and bridleway (and access road to the Nursing Home) that runs along Montford road and through the woodlands is bordered by a number of beautiful old trees that would be destroyed by this development (even if preservation orders were placed on them). The loss of these woodlands, trees and open space would have a detrimental impact upon the environment, the wildlife and public that live in the area
317	17	A development of 700 houses would place adverse pressure on the sewerage and drainage systems for the area. There is already a significant problem with drainage overflow from the drains that run parallel/adjacent to St Mark's close which frequently overflow and flood in heavy rain.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
317	18	The case for the need for an additional 700 houses on site 35 and in the Worksop area has not been proven as there is insufficient economic and industrial development in the area to warrant such huge developments
317	19	The local shops and amenities are sited off the main Gateford estates and area ready busy to point of reaching capacity. Additional housing, especially of this scale, will place an intolerable pressure on the already inadequate road system around Gateford/Gateford Road area. The junctions onto Gateford Road from Ashes Park Avenue and Lady Walk are already congested and hazardous, additional traffic from a major housing development would place a dangerous strain on these and the Edison Park/Carlton Road junctions. Given that the majority of those living on the proposed site 35 development would be commuting by car this is a real issue to those of us that live here. The main roads in the area are also poorly suited to an increase in traffic commuting to the Sheffield/Doncaster/Nottingham areas. The options for access to the development itself from Ashes Park Avenue are small estate roads not suitable for such a huge increase in traffic. These traffic issues would have a detrimental impact on the environment and on the safety of our children when walking to school or out playing
317	20	The capacity of schools, nurseries and other services in the area has been reached and would require further investment.
318	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable for development in the future
318	2	Option A
319	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable for housing development in the future
319	2	Option A
320	1	Not really. There seems to be no consideration that existing brownfield sites in the area would be much more suitable and less damaging to the environment than new greenfield sites.
320	2	I believe Gateford in particular is already highly populated and the estate around Ashes Park Avenue. Is already at its maximum size regarding access in and out of the estate being completely restricted to 2 points only at the moment
320	3	Location 35 is totally unsuitable
320	4	The estate access restrictions to 2 points only is already causing traffic problems. 700 new houses would almost double the problem
320	5	This development would also destroy the public footpath through the fields and through to Owday lane. This public footpath has been in place for decades is in a very popular walkway. Used everyday by lots of people
320	6	The development completely denies any access to the countryside enjoyed for many years. Access cannot be made any other ways as the land of the nursing home and woods to the left of the development are private land
320	7	The greenfield location is beautiful and adds completely to the large estate already in place. The estate has a very nice accompanying countryside location
320	8	Option A
320	9	Absolutely not, after the problems caused a few years ago when the land off Ashes Park Avenue
320	10	Controlled sites away from estate developments. They do not need to be close together
320	11	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
320	12	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
320	13	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
320	14	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area.
320	15	In addition, Increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
320	16	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
320	17	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
320	18	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical.
320	19	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
321	1	I think that location 35 is unsuitable.
321	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
322	7	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
322	8	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
322	9	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
322	10	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
322	11	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
322	12	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
322	13	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
322	14	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
323	1	Unsure
323	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
323	3	I think the villages could tolerate 12 and no more. There are no facilities for a large increase in housing and the school is small.
323	4	I think Corner farm is a dangerous spot to build homes. The access for roads on such a sharp corner would be very dangerous. There was a very bad accident there just before Christmas and if we increased traffic due to housing this could become a regular occurrence. Children crossing the road to access the school bus stop outside the Kings Arms on a dark winter morning could be very vulnerable from the heavy traffic that comes through the village at the morning rush hour Drainage might be a problem too. After the flooding a couple of years ago any extra homes the council would need to consider the impact to the rest of the village particularly Clarborough.
323	5	Site number 242 might be the best one to develop as it is on the outside of the village and would have less congestion as adequate access can be developed off the main road.
323	6	As a resident of Broadgores off Big Lane I feel strongly that the sites marked 258 and 170 should not be developed.
323	7	If the two Broadgores roads were joined it would undoubtedly lead to an increase in traffic on Big Lane a road which already struggles to cope with the traffic for Southview Drive etc. Many residents park on Big Lane and vision along the road when driving is poor at times and an increase' in traffic would make this even more hazardous.
323	8	REMOVED
323	9	On a personal level I feel sure this would lead to a reduction in the price of my property something which in this economic climate would be very unacceptable.
323	10	The schools cannot cope with a huge increase in housing and transport to town schools would prove problematic I am sure
323	11	There are problems with sewage and flooding in the village and this would only make matters worse. internet access would be made worse as more households put pressure on the already slow system
323	12	Open spaces are very important and should be protected to maintain the integrity of village life.
323	13	No I do not. I do not feel it appropriate to place gypsies and travellers in the village as I do not believe they would want to live here and villagers would not welcome them into the community.
323	14	Many sites that have been provided have been a waste of money as they have never been occupied. Has the council even negotiated with travelling families to see if this is where they would want to live. The area suggested would be prone to flooding as drainage is an issue.
323	15	REMOVED
323	16	Property prices would once again be affected and people would want to leave the village affecting the community spirit of the place.
323	17	REMOVED
323	18	Interestingly there is a site at Treswell that has never been used. I pass it every day going to work and I have never seen it used.
323	19	Unaware.
324	1	Yes
324	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
324	3	Yes we agree

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
324	4	Sites 462 and 456 are the best for housing
324	5	Area near the public house tends to flood
324	6	Protect the play area
324	7	Existing ones
324	8	Together
325	1	Yes.
325	2	Option A
325	3	164 and 165 make sense to grow.
325	4	Yes at least.
325	5	Upgrade in the play area would be nice.
325	6	Existing sites.
325	7	Together
326	1	Option A
326	2	I do not consider that there is any need for further housing in Gamston as existing houses are often on the market for a long period of time before they are sold.
326	3	14 out of 22 people (63.6%) stated in the Gamston Future Development Questionnaire (“Development Questionnaire”) that no further housing was required.
326	4	If new housing is required for Gamston then brown field sites should be used before existing green field sites. The majority of respondents to the Development Questionnaire favoured prioritising development on brown field sites and not development of existing green field sites.
326	5	The obvious site to develop would be Site 410, the site of the former Bramcote Lorne School which could easily accommodate five new houses and which already has buildings on the site. Any new housing on this site would also be well away from existing housing.
326	6	The next best site to develop would be Site 412/413 although this site is a green field site. However, this site is on the east side of the Great North Road and further away from existing housing and so less likely to interfere with existing properties than Sites 577 or 534.
326	7	Site 577 should not be being developed for the following reasons: 1) This site is an existing green field site and is in the conservation area.
326	8	2) This site is very close to existing housing including my own house. My living room windows are only around 12 feet away from the border of this site.
326	9	3) Any new housing on this site would overlook my property, block out light from my windows and interfere with the view from my living room/dining room and bedroom windows. This would be an intrusion on my privacy and interfere with my quiet enjoyment of my property. It would also devalue my property.
326	10	4) There would be major problems accessing any new houses built on this site as it can only be accessed by a narrow lane next to the old persons bungalows and which is also used to access another house behind me.
326	11	5) Any new housing would be out of character with the other houses nearby which are large detached houses with large gardens. This would also affect the character and traditional look of the village.
326	12	The Council needs to introduce a 30mph speed limit through the village for the following reasons: a) The A638 through Gamston is a very dangerous road. It is basically two long straight pieces of road with a bend in the middle. Therefore, many cars, lorries and motorcycles approach the bend at 60mph or higher, brake at the last moment, and then accelerate from the bend as quickly as possible. There is a particular problem with motorcyclists who use this piece of road as a racetrack.
326	13	b) The fact that vehicles approach the bend on the A638 in Gamston at great speed from both directions often means that vehicles are in the centre of road when they drive round the bend. This increases the risk of an accident occurring on the bend. A young man from Tuxford was killed in a head on collision on the bend due to a car driving at great speed from the Retford direction.
326	14	c) The chance of an accident happening on the A638 is also increased by the fact that (travelling from the Retford direction) there are two right turns. The first right turn is the road to Walesby and Ollerton. The second right turn is into Gamston village just before the bend. I always feel very uncomfortable about using the right turn into Gamston village because I consider that there is a danger of being hit in the rear by a vehicle travelling at great speed from Retford, or by a vehicle cornering at high speed from the Tuxford direction.
326	15	d) There are young children who live in Gamston or who attend the local school. They have to cross the road to reach the school. This fact alone justifies a 30mph speed limit for the village. There is no sign for cars travelling south into Gamston to warn them that there is a school in the village around the bend and so they need to slow down.
326	16	Why do other similar small villages in North Nottinghamshire (or Nottinghamshire as a county) have speed limits but there are no speed limits for Gamston?
326	17	I understand the parish council in Gamston are prepared to make a financial contribution to the cost of imposing speed limits in Gamston.
326	18	Yes
326	19	The obvious site to develop would be Site 410, the site of the former Bramcote Lorne School which could easily accommodate five new houses and which already has buildings on the site. Any new housing on this site would also be well away from existing housing.
326	20	It would be nice to see this site developed rather than the old Bramcote Lorne School being boarded up or knocked down. If housing is built on this site then it would also be good if it included facilities which could be used by the rest of the village such as a village hall, park/playing field and even sports facilities such as tennis courts.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
326	21	It could also include a village shop and post office.
326	22	I do not think there is any need to increase Gypsy and Traveller sites in the District. These sites always cause a great deal of distress for residents living nearby. Please explain why it is necessary to provide any new sites.
326	23	See above
326	24	See above
327	1	I agree that land should be allocated in East Markham but with little or no development of housing over the last few years the question of ,(at least 11) covering the next 15 years may be a little undermining for East Markham in its growth potential unless windfall developments have been considered as potential with some sites a minimum of 25 should be considered
327	2	Site 111 part site 112
327	3	Site 111 (a derelict ex railway site with no contamination) along59 with part 112 may offer a high via ability as a small development site having a level topology with an easily accessible extended frontage to road side and its infrastructure. This area of Lincoln Road has been created as a Cul-de-sac due to road closure from the raising of the main railway line, within a well drained area of East Markham the site is not identified "at risk of flood" by the environmental agency.
327	4	The site, located adjacent to East Markham's original development boundary offers no visual impact, special scientific interest or heritage reference due to its location, nor loss of privacy offering development of a scale and type appropriate to this settlement area and surrounding [and use. Proposals of development would be offered with off-street parking
327	5	No comment
328	1	I am not aware for the need for more housing to become available.
328	2	I do believe that the town should have a shopping centre & an entertainment park like Centertainment in Sheffield.
328	3	I know that location 35 unsuitable for various reasons.
328	4	Locations W13, 195, 343 & W8
328	5	28, W6 & Gateford Residential Nursing Home, The Lawn, The Rookery, Gateford Hall Farm, California Farm, & Ashes Wood should all be protected.
328	6	Now I remember that this government said we will become a greener country & what is being proposed is totally against this.
328	7	I do not believe that we need more housing in Worksop, it is a nice town as it already is. We should be protecting what we have. (Greenery & nature).
328	8	Option A
328	9	No
328	10	Together so that people will see the advantages as well as disadvantages.
329	1	Yes, it all seems fairly reasonable.
329	2	Option A
329	3	I do not agree.
329	4	These are rural villages - new housing on this scale will neither complement or enhance particularly in Hayton where individual properties give the village its distinct character.
329	5	There would be extra traffic on already dangerous and over burdened roads.
329	6	Development would result in loss of hedgerows & habitats and the green infrastructure of the villages would be adversely affected.
329	7	Furthermore, there is insufficient drainage & sewerage capacity - both villages have suffered severe flooding problems in recent years.
329	8	No, my view would not change, though if there had to be development it would be preferable on the edge of the village as per Corner Farm.
329	9	I would not like to see any site developed on this scale.
329	10	No
329	11	Yes, I agree that these open spaces identified on the map should be protected.
329	12	I think that any new sites should be concentrated in and around existing sites because the necessary services and facilities are already in place.
329	13	These should be provided together as their requirements are very similar in that both require a 'pitch', safe vehicular access to roads, appropriate landscaping of the area etc.
329	14	No
330	1	Option A
330	2	There should be no more houses in the villages.
330	3	The plots indicated are all outside the previously established building lines in conflict with previous planning policy.
330	4	Many properties will be overlooked & lose their privacy
330	5	Extra traffic would be generated on village roads which are already very busy particularly on Smeath Lane where road safety is already a major concern due to all the heavy lorries.
330	6	Road safety is also a concern around Hillview Crescent where children are walking to and from school.
330	7	Infrastructure will be inadequate to support further development particularly drainage.
330	8	The housing densities proposed are inappropriate in these village settings.
330	9	If the application is granted it purely reinforces our arguments that no further developments should be permitted.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
330	10	No further sites should be developed.
330	11	The plots indicated are all outside the previously established building lines in conflict with previous planning policy.
330	12	Many properties will be overlooked & lose their privacy
330	13	Extra traffic would be generated on village roads which are already very busy particularly on Smeath Lane where road safety is already a major concern due to all the heavy lorries.
330	14	The housing densities proposed are inappropriate in these village settings.
330	15	Road safety is also a concern around Hillview Crescent where children are walking to and from school.
330	16	Yes
330	17	Yes - the amenities and infrastructure for such sites are already in place and extending them would create less disruption than developing new sites.
330	18	Together as the amenities and infrastructure for such sites are already in place and extending them would create less disruption than developing new sites.
331	1	I am a resident in Clarborough and wish to express my views on the proposed building plans for Clarborough and Hayton. I do not agree with the houses that are being proposed for building as I know it will have a terrible impact on the village for many reasons.
331	2	Firstly, the traffic flow. The suggestions for Site Reference 170 and 258 on the housing plan will connect the two ends of Broad Gores. This will produce a through road which changes the nature of the current cul-de-sacs. Both Smeath Lane, Big Lane and both ends of Broad Gores are very narrow roads which are unsuitable to increased traffic flows. In addition any contractor traffic during a construction phase would be extremely dangerous if not impossible. The access from Smeath Lane and Big Lane onto the A620 can already be hazardous, especially at peak times. With the 30mph speed limit which is mainly ignored, turning right out of Big Lane towards Retford, especially, is already a dangerous procedure due to the short sight lines along the A620 towards the village centre.
331	3	In times of snow (eg December 2010) local roads are not gritted by local councils. This left Smeath Lane, Broad Gores and Gill Green Walk in a dangerous condition for about 4 weeks, with many near misses as vehicles, mostly carefully, negotiated snow, ice and ruts. Increased traffic flow would make an accident inevitable. I know the weather conditions also had the same effect on the other side of the village due to not having gritters.
331	4	The land concerned is liable to flooding during heavy rainfall and little has been done to alleviate this since the most recent floods which affected a number of areas of the village. There is a history of poor sewage facilities in the village, especially on the western side of Main Street, ie in the area where the largest concentration of housing is suggested and there is already some concern on St John's Drive about the quality of the water supply.
331	5	The Primary School is currently full, additional housing and families could lead to serious overcrowding. There is currently a serious problem with parking in the vicinity of the school at the beginning and end of the school day. Any further numbers in the school will only make this worse.
331	6	The overall road provision in the village is too small for much extra traffic. The A620 is already a very busy road with many large vehicles exceeding the 30mph speed limit through the village. The dangers of Welham corner are well known as HGV drivers continue to ignore warning signs for the low bridge. Tiln Lane - Smeath Lane is the only route which allows high sided HGV's up to 40t to travel from Retford to Gainsborough as it avoids the low railway bridge in Clarborough, despite it being an unclassified country lane. There are a large number of these travelling the road in each direction every day. Only in the Tiln Lane section is the road wide enough to allow two HGV's to pass and this with care. Much of Smeath Lane does not allow passing and vehicles have to use the road verges. Over the years this has resulted in a number of these vehicles overturning into ditches. It is therefore, a dangerous road.
331	7	As vehicles enter the village from Retford along Smeath Lane there have to cross a "humped back" canal bridge. Many do this at some speed despite the one way nature which their size imposes on the bridge. They immediately come into residential housing where cars are turning in order to enter Broad Gores or private drives. Putting nearly 100 houses onto Site References 170 and 258 will create much more traffic movement at the junction between Smeath lane and Broad Gores which will increase the dangers of road transport.
331	8	There is no shop, post office, leisure facilities or medical facility in the village. This in turn would generate extra traffic through the village and on the roads into Retford. There is no provision for jobs in the village. Indeed, in recent months several jobs have been lost due to the closure of the shop and the Kings Arms public house. If the planning application for Corner House Farm (on the corner of Main Street and Clarborough Hill, Site Reference 171) is successful, then even more jobs are likely to be lost.
331	9	The timing of buses means that anyone wishing to make even a short visit to Retford and carry out business there (eg a visit to the post office) faces a 2-3 hour round trip.
331	10	For any resident without their own transport, including teenagers, there is no opportunity to access any event in Retford in the late afternoon and evening. The use of personal cars will again increase traffic flow through and into and out of the village.
331	11	REMOVED
331	12	The junction at the top of Smeath Lane/Corner Farm and the bottom of Clarborough Hill is a danger with the amount of traffic flow now, not to mention the poor visibility when turning right when coming down the hill. Only last month there was a serious accident at this junction where all 3 emergency services were called to overturned vehicles.
332	1	I am writing to express my concern for the plan to build 93 houses on sites 170 and 258 the end of Broad gores Clarborough and the impact it will have on the lovely quiet village i reside in at present!!
332	2	Clarborough is a small village with a population of approx 500 people i believe and this development potentially could increase the population by half again maybe more !! I feel i have a number of valid reasons for objecting to this development and hope that you will give them some consideration

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
332	3	Firstly i am a governor at (No Suggestions) school which at present is almost fully subscribed , we have a number of concerns over child safety due to the parking and access to the school via hillview crescent. Traffic regularly tracks back onto main street at school times causing congestion and a danger to children leaving school as traffic passes through the village. There is also not a sufficient number of parking facilities and although we are in the process of making a path from the village hall so that parents can park there if the school was to expand further in the future then this would not be sufficient .It is a big concern that dangerous parking is an accident waiting to happen for someone's child and steps are being taken where possible to prevent this. I feel that due to the location of the school expanding its numbers further due to its location is not an option and although you could argue that residents on this new development are within walking distance you cant prevent them dropping there children off in the car on there way to work town etc.
332	4	Secondly traffic in the village is a constant problem increasing the population further would add to congestion/traffic in a village not created for a greater capacity !!
332	5	Thirdly the drainage and sewage on St Johns /Broad gores is very poor with many residents suffering from blocked drains on a regular basis adding more houses would surely create greater problems.
332	6	Fourthly the water supply to Broad gores / St Johns is also poor with leaks and poor pressure and extra houses would add to this further etc.
332	7	Fifthly and one of the important issues is the recent flooding of a number of houses in the village when the beck overflowed the beck runs around the sites and flooding would potentially be a factor as at present the land soaks up the rain water turning it into a partially concreted area would just add to more water to fill the beck putting residents at risk.
332	8	Also traffic would become a factor on broadgores with the two parts joining making it a cut through from smeath lane avoiding main street at busy times etc during the snow last year big lane wasn't gritted and was barely passible for a number of weeks if such a large number of houses were to be reached from this one road then this would need to be considered. Both broad gores and big lane are narrow and not designed for a large volume of traffic with a number of regularly parked cars causing problems at busy times already without increased traffic flows!!!
332	9	For anyone joining the village the public transport network is poor with only a limited bus service there is no longer a shop or post office only one public house and no job provisions. It is a quiet village and we as its residents would like to keep it this way, I moved here with my family for that reason and don't want to see it spoilt due to overcrowding!! The parish council suggested that Approximately 12 houses was the maximum capacity the village could cope with and i believe planning has already been granted on corner farm for more than this number already !!
333	1	I do not agree to the 12 houses that are proposed to be built as from the feedback from the questionnaires. After attending the Parish Council meeting last month I was informed that 19 dwellings will be built on Corner Farm, at the bottom of the hill. As I believe this is already going ahead no matter what, I certainly do not want to see more houses built on plots of land in Clarborough and Hayton. My reasons are as follows:
333	2	Primary School - The Primary School is currently full, additional housing and families could lead to serious overcrowding. There is currently a serious problem with parking in the vicinity of the school at the beginning and end of the school day. Any further numbers in the school will only make this worse.
333	3	Sewage - There is a history of poor sewage facilities in the village, especially on the western side of Main Street, ie in the area where the largest concentration of housing is suggested.
333	4	Water Supply - There is already some concern on St John's Drive about the quality of the water supply.
333	5	Broadband - The village is so far from the telephone exchange in Retford that much online provision is not available in the village or speeds are too low for meaningful internet access. (eg if you access BBC iplayer you are likely to get either a programme which stops every few minutes to load the next section or a message saying there is not enough bandwidth to load anything at all!) In the digital age this should be a serious concern.
333	6	Flooding - The land concerned is liable to flooding during heavy rainfall and little has been done to alleviate this since the most recent floods which affected a number of areas of the village.
333	7	Jobs - There is no provision for jobs in the village. Indeed, in recent months several jobs have been lost due to the closure of the shop and the Kings Arms public house. If the planning application for Corner House Farm (on the corner of Main Street and Clarborough Hill, Site Reference 171) is successful, then even more jobs are likely to be lost.
333	8	Traffic Flow -The suggestions for Site Reference 170 and 258 on the housing plan will connect the two ends of Broad Gores. This will produce a through road which changes the nature of the current cul-de-sacs. Both Big Lane and both ends of Broad Gores are very narrow roads which are unsuitable to increased traffic flows. In addition any contractor traffic during a construction phase would be extremely dangerous if not impossible.
333	9	The access from Big Lane onto the A620 can already be hazardous, especially at peak times. With the 30mph speed limit, and much does not, turning right out of Big Lane towards Retford, especially, is already a dangerous procedure due to the short sight lines along the A620 towards the village centre.
333	10	In times of snow (eg December 2010) local roads are not gritted by local councils. This left Big Lane in a dangerous condition for about 4 weeks, with many near misses as vehicles, mostly carefully, negotiated snow, ice and ruts. Increased traffic flow would make an accident inevitable.
333	11	Public Transport - Buses into Retford are Monday to Friday: hourly service between 0724 and 1428 hours; Saturday: as above plus one extra bus at 1658 hours; Sunday: no service. Buses from Retford are: Monday to Friday: hourly service between 0930 and 1430 hours, then 1555 and 1750 hours; Saturday: as above; Sunday: no service. The timing of buses means that anyone wishing to make even a short visit to Retford and carry out business there (eg a visit to the post office) faces a 2-3 hour round trip.
333	12	For any resident without their own transport, including teenagers, there is no opportunity to access any event in Retford in the late afternoon and evening. The use of personal cars will again increase traffic flow through and into and out of the village.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
333	13	Village traffic - The overall road provision in the village is too small for much extra traffic. The A620 is already a very busy road with many large vehicles exceeding the 30mph speed limit through the village. The dangers of Welham corner are well known as HGV drivers continue to ignore warning signs for the low bridge.
333	14	Tiln Lane - Smeath Lane is the only route which allows high sided HGV's up to 40t to travel from Retford to Gainsborough as it avoids the low railway bridge in Clarborough, despite it being an unclassified country lane. There are a large number of these travelling the road in each direction every day. Only in the Tiln Lane section is the road wide enough to allow two HGV's to pass and this with care. Much of Smeath Lane does not allow passing and vehicles have to use the road verges. Over the years this has resulted in a number of these vehicles overturning into ditches. It is therefore, a dangerous road. As vehicles enter the village from Retford along Smeath Lane there have to cross a "humped back" canal bridge. Many do this at some speed despite the one way nature which their size imposes on the bridge. They immediately come into residential housing where cars are turning in order to enter Broad Gores or private drives. Putting nearly 100 houses onto Site References 170 and 258 will create much more traffic movement at the junction between Smeath lane and Broad Gores which will increase the dangers of road transport.
333	15	Facilities - There is no shop, post office, leisure facilities or medical facility in the village. This in turn would generate extra traffic through the village and on the roads into Retford.
333	16	REMOVED
333	17	The junction at the top of Smeath Lane/Corner Farm and the bottom of Clarborough Hill is a danger with the amount of traffic flow now, not to mention the poor visibility when turning right when coming down the hill. Only last month there was a serious accident at this junction where all 3 emergency services were called to overturned vehicles.
334	1	I do not agree to the 12 houses that are proposed to be built as from the feedback from the questionnaires. After attending the Parish Council meeting last month I was informed that 19 dwellings will be built on Corner Farm, at the bottom of the hill. As I believe this is already going ahead no matter what, I certainly do not want to see more houses built on plots of land in Clarborough and Hayton. My reasons are as follows:
334	2	Primary School - The Primary School is currently full, additional housing and families could lead to serious overcrowding. There is currently a serious problem with parking in the vicinity of the school at the beginning and end of the school day. Any further numbers in the school will only make this worse.
334	3	Sewage - There is a history of poor sewage facilities in the village, especially on the western side of Main Street, ie in the area where the largest concentration of housing is suggested.
334	4	Water Supply - There is already some concern on St John's Drive about the quality of the water supply.
334	5	Broadband - The village is so far from the telephone exchange in Retford that much online provision is not available in the village or speeds are too low for meaningful internet access. (eg if you access BBC iplayer you are likely to get either a programme which stops every few minutes to load the next section or a message saying there is not enough bandwidth to load anything at all!) In the digital age this should be a serious concern.
334	6	Flooding - The land concerned is liable to flooding during heavy rainfall and little has been done to alleviate this since the most recent floods which affected a number of areas of the village.
334	7	Jobs - There is no provision for jobs in the village. Indeed, in recent months several jobs have been lost due to the closure of the shop and the Kings Arms public house. If the planning application for Corner House Farm (on the corner of Main Street and Clarborough Hill, Site Reference 171) is successful, then even more jobs are likely to be lost.
334	8	Traffic Flow -The suggestions for Site Reference 170 and 258 on the housing plan will connect the two ends of Broad Gores. This will produce a through road which changes the nature of the current cul-de-sacs. Both Big Lane and both ends of Broad Gores are very narrow roads which are unsuitable to increased traffic flows. In addition any contractor traffic during a construction phase would be extremely dangerous if not impossible.
334	9	The access from Big Lane onto the A620 can already be hazardous, especially at peak times. With the 30mph speed limit, and much does not, turning right out of Big Lane towards Retford, especially, is already a dangerous procedure due to the short sight lines along the A620 towards the village centre.
334	10	In times of snow (eg December 2010) local roads are not gritted by local councils. This left Big Lane in a dangerous condition for about 4 weeks, with many near misses as vehicles, mostly carefully, negotiated snow, ice and ruts. Increased traffic flow would make an accident inevitable.
334	11	Public Transport - Buses into Retford are Monday to Friday: hourly service between 0724 and 1428 hours; Saturday: as above plus one extra bus at 1658 hours; Sunday: no service. Buses from Retford are: Monday to Friday: hourly service between 0930 and 1430 hours, then 1555 and 1750 hours; Saturday: as above; Sunday: no service. The timing of buses means that anyone wishing to make even a short visit to Retford and carry out business there (eg a visit to the post office) faces a 2-3 hour round trip.
334	12	For any resident without their own transport, including teenagers, there is no opportunity to access any event in Retford in the late afternoon and evening. The use of personal cars will again increase traffic flow through and into and out of the village.
334	13	Village traffic - The overall road provision in the village is too small for much extra traffic. The A620 is already a very busy road with many large vehicles exceeding the 30mph speed limit through the village. The dangers of Welham corner are well known as HGV drivers continue to ignore warning signs for the low bridge.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
334	14	Tiln Lane - Smeath Lane is the only route which allows high sided HGV's up to 40t to travel from Retford to Gainsborough as it avoids the low railway bridge in Clarborough, despite it being an unclassified country lane. There are a large number of these travelling the road in each direction every day. Only in the Tiln Lane section is the road wide enough to allow two HGV's to pass and this with care. Much of Smeath Lane does not allow passing and vehicles have to use the road verges. Over the years this has resulted in a number of these vehicles overturning into ditches. It is therefore, a dangerous road. As vehicles enter the village from Retford along Smeath Lane there have to cross a "humped back" canal bridge. Many do this at some speed despite the one way nature which their size imposes on the bridge. They immediately come into residential housing where cars are turning in order to enter Broad Gores or private drives. Putting nearly 100 houses onto Site References 170 and 258 will create much more traffic movement at the junction between Smeath lane and Broad Gores which will increase the dangers of road transport.
334	15	Facilities - There is no shop, post office, leisure facilities or medical facility in the village. This in turn would generate extra traffic through the village and on the roads into Retford.
334	16	REMOVED
334	17	The junction at the top of Smeath Lane/Corner Farm and the bottom of Clarborough Hill is a danger with the amount of traffic flow now, not to mention the poor visibility when turning right when coming down the hill. Only last month there was a serious accident at this junction where all 3 emergency services were called to overturned vehicles.
335	1	Yes
335	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
335	3	I believe the village should see between 10-15 over 18 years.
335	4	410 and 577 are the most suitable sites for building
335	5	All should be protected
335	6	Yes, this is currently standing vacant and needs developing for housing or employment
336	1	The Parish Council have asked me to write formally to you outlining their position with regard to achieving planning consents for a public house and restaurant within our parish. You are aware that planning consent has been achieved for the Station Rd site. This was only after appeal and with some opposition. The original site identified previously and refused both by you and on appeal, is still deemed to be the sensible location with least disruption to our community (site number 102 close to the Village Hall). The Council have already conducted a survey of the community and ascertained the need and aspirations of our local residents. This site proved well supported as documentation at the time would confirm. I hold various letters written to The Council since your consultation event urging them to secure, if possible site 102 for the public house and restaurant and mindful of these requests and The Parish Councils aspirations to achieve the community's wishes, we would ask that you note our request in your final document.
336	2	Multi or Individual applications should be incorporated within any total number allocated.
336	3	The Council has initiated the commencement meeting to prepare and adopt a Village Design Statement.
336	4	The Councils submissions for Green spaces already submitted.
336	5	The Community/Council submissions for the site of a Public House already submitted.
336	6	The Parish Council consider that the survey result of the community on further housing should be noted.
336	7	The Parish Council have elected 3 Councillors and Clerk to attend BDC meetings on 18 and 25th January 2012 with places confirmed.
337	1	They all seem fair to me and seem to cover most aspects
337	2	The amount of housing allocated up to 2028 seems low I would have thought that a percentage nearer 30% would be favourable.
337	3	But we do need to make sure the infrastructure can cope - i.e. the inner ring road gets totally clogged up from London Road round to Moorgage. Could an outer ring road from say Eton Corner round the East side of town be considered - going across Welham Road (over the railway near Leverton Road) then across Tiln Lane to hit the Great North Road just north of Hallcroft. That would alleviate the problems of lorries using Tiln Lane because of the low bridges and keep all the lorries going to Gainsborough etc. out of town - or would that just be ridiculously expensive?
337	4	By the way, the housing we need are family type housing plus some over 55s units. We do not need any more flats - the ones in the town centre are sitting empty.
337	5	It seems to me that the sites off to the south west are rather stuck out on a limb and the Ordsall area generally seems to be just a sprawl that is getting further and further away from the town centre and the core of Retford.
337	6	I would think it would be better to use more obvious infill areas such as 489, 488 and particular the areas to the north east of town 46, 309.
337	7	The area to the north east of town is very accessible to the town centre and hasn't grown outwards from the centre to the extent that has happened to the other sides of Retford
337	8	The site on the North Road seems to me to be the most favourable as the main road links are easy. However a roundabout may be needed on the North Road to ease access and egress.
337	9	The site to the south west at Ordsall seems to be cut off from the rest of town and would cause more problems on the narrow roads through Ordsall.
337	10	Although I appreciate the ease of getting to the A1 from site R2 but that would be near Elkesley and there are enough problems with getting on and off the A1 in that area without creating more.
337	11	See my answer to Q11 above
337	12	It would make sense to build housing on the infill areas so as to keep a sensibly shaped envelope without bits sticking out on a limb.
337	13	There seem to be a reasonable number of open spaces but not enough that we can afford to lose any so they should be kept back from development

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
337	14	Option A
337	15	I think they should be concentrated around existing sites. I believe there are four in Bassetlaw and understand that there is space around them for some expansion.
337	16	I think they should be together.
337	17	Sorry not sure
338	1	<p>We have strong reservations regarding Criterion 1 of the Site Assessment Criteria which looks to question if the local community is supportive of the development of potential allocation sites. Whilst we acknowledge that such an approach appears in theory to be in line with the emerging localism agenda of the Government we consider in practice this is fraught with difficulty and is likely to introduce bias into the assessment. We welcome the Council's indication in paragraph 2.23 that benefits to the local community may be highlighted, but don't consider that this has been carried forward into the traffic light scoring system for the criterion which appears to be exclusively based on local opinion. We believe that some sites will not gain support from the local community but will still offer strong community benefits, yet according to the traffic light system would probably score a red.</p> <p>The nature of and reason for the support or objection also needs to be considered to ensure it is not just the most vocal and active members of local communities that have their views heard as part of the allocations consultation. In our opinion it may also be possible to gauge local community support more effectively in some settlements than in others. In villages for instance a greater proportion of residents are likely to give an objective opinion on the merit of alternative sites which would be supplemented by the views of the Parish Council. In larger towns with no Parish or Town Council in existence objective broader views are less likely to be expressed and comments will be dominated by residents directly affected by the development of particular sites.</p> <p>In light of the above considerations we consider that 'local community support should be deleted as a specific Criterion. Therefore when assessing William Davis interests against the Site Assessment Criteria in our accompanying letters, we have not included Criterion 1.</p>
338	2	William Davis Ltd also have concerns regarding the scoring system for Criterion 6, which considers the impact on Landscape Character. The traffic light system scores the sites according to their landscape character zone within the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment, but it is not clear on how sites would score if they fall within two separate character zones. For example a site could be located in a Conserve and Reinforce zone, and it is unclear whether such a site would score as a red or amber in the traffic light system. This issue needs further consideration or more guidance to help clarify the situation.
338	3	William Davis Ltd control this site under option and have continuously promoted the site for allocation in the Bassetlaw LDF. The most up to date SHLAA found the site to be developable in 6-10 years, but we believe that subject to a successful planning application the site could be delivered for housing within 5 years. This stance is supported by our continued promotion of the site in planning policy consultations and commitment to building up an evidence base in support of the site's allocation.
338	4	An analysis of the site using the Site Assessment Criteria established in the Issues and Options consultation has been completed and is attached to these representations. The site will not result in the loss of the best agricultural land and is not in a protected landscape zone or in water source protection zone 1. The site is bordered by residential land use to the south and east and would continue a prominent building line that runs along the northern edge of Worksop in this location. Design of the site would be compatible with the surrounding land uses and would seek to maintain the existing built character of the essentially suburban area.
338	5	William Davis Ltd have continued to maintain and update a strong evidence base in support of the site. This includes recent updates of the Transport Appraisal and Ecological Appraisal, copies of which have been included with this letter. A summary of this supporting evidence base is provided below:
338	6	Ecology: An updated Ecological Appraisal has been completed by FPCR in October 2011. The site is found to be of generally low biodiversity value. Not bats or badgers have been identified on site and the only ecological potential is the existing boundary hedgerow that could support roosting birds. Consequently the ecological appraisal highlights no constraints to the site in terms of existing ecological interest.
338	7	Transport: Waterman Boreham Transport Planning have produced a Site Appraisal Report (July 2011) which considers the local highways network. The report finds no constraints to development in terms of the local highways network and indicates in the summary that the site could "satisfactorily be accommodated within the existing transport infrastructure". The report also finds the site to be in a sustainable location with good access to local bus stops and that local journeys within Worksop could be undertaken on foot or by cycle.
338	8	A single point of access including the provision of emergency access is available from Hemmingfield Rise, with the principle of this access agreed with the County Highways Authority. Consequently the site has no constraints in terms of access and the impact it would have on the local highway network.
338	9	Landscape: As indicated in our use of the Issues and Options reports Site Assessment Criteria the site is found to be in a Create Policy Zone of the Council's Landscape Character Assessment and is consequently seen as within the least valuable landscape character surrounding Worksop. In September 2007, Munro and Whitten completed a Landscape Assessment (previously provided to the Council) which found that "A well considered development will allow the extension of the current urban envelope into the current urban fringe landscape". Through considerate design including retention and improvement of the northern boundary hedgerow of the site we consider the site to be a suitable site for development which will result in a sheltered and enclosed residential scheme which will not detract from the local landscape character.
338	10	As the evidence base demonstrates the site has no constraints that would prevent its development. William Davis therefore support the allocation of the site for up to 65 dwellings to help meet the housing targets for Worksop established in the Core Strategy.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
338	11	As indicated above William Davis Ltd support the development of land to the North of Mansfield Road (Site Reference:9). We have an option on this site and have continuously promoted the land for allocation in earlier stages of the LDF process. This highlights the firm commitment of a housing developer to the development of the land to the north of Mansfield Road and highlights that should the site be allocated it will be available to be delivered subject to a satisfactory planning permission. The most up to date version of the Council's SHLAA found the site to be deliverable in 6 to 10 years. William Davis disagree with this analysis, subject to gaining planning permission the site could be delivered within the next 5 years.
338	12	Using the Council's Site Assessment Criteria detailed in the issues and options document we have reviewed the site north of Mansfield Road. A copy of our assessment has been attached to these representations and shows that the site scores well against the Criteria with amber and green scores dominant over the 9 criteria. The only Criterion which may be considered as red is concerned with landscape impact, with the site's location in a Conserve and Reinforce policy zone indicating that a red score should be given. However as we have indicate in our assessment of the site against the criteria, a landscape assessment carried out on the site by Munro + Whitten Ltd indicated that <i>"a well considered development will allow the extension of the current urban envelope into the <u>diverse and disjointed</u> urban fringe landscape"</i> . This document has been issued to the Council through earlier promotion of the site and clearly challenges the conserve nature of the landscape assessment. Due to the localised and site specific nature of our landscape assessment we believe some weight should be given to its findings when considering the site as part of the issues and options consultation.
338	13	Archaeology: A Desk Based Assessment of the site was completed by CGMS in 2007, a copy of which has been previously issued to the Council during the promotion of the site. The document recommends further work in the form of a watching brief to mitigate against potential archaeological interest on the site, but concludes that any remains are unlikely to merit preservation in situ. The DBA also notes the potential impact on the grade 1 listed building Manor Lodge, recommending a scheme of landscaping to the northern area of the site to filter and soften views from the listed building. This is a recommendation that has been incorporated into early designs for the site, with open space and landscaping planned for the northern section of the site. William Davis have discussed this issue with English Heritage and Conservation Officers at the Council who have indicated they would raise no objection to development of the site subject to detailed master planning respecting the setting of Manor Lodge.
338	14	Ecology: An updated Ecological Appraisal has been produced by FPCR in September 2011, a copy of which is attached to these representations. Due to the intensely managed arable nature of the majority of the site the land to the north of Mansfield Road is found to be of low biodiversity value. Some habitat value is found in the boundary hedgerows which include several trees with the potential for bat roosts. Early indicative layouts for the site include the retention of the majority of said hedgerows, further reducing any impact on biodiversity on site. Further surveys are recommended on any trees and hedgerows proposed to be removed for mitigation should roosts be discovered
338	15	Transport: Waterman Boreham Ltd have produced a Site Appraisal Report (October 2011) which is attached to these representations. Junction assessments were completed on the A57/A60 and A60/A619 junctions following concerns raised regarding their capacity in the District Wide Transport Study. The site appraisal report includes proposed improvements to these junctions that would improve the identified capacity problems. The overall conclusion of the appraisal is that "...development could satisfactorily be accommodated within the existing transport infrastructure, subject to the improvements detailed in this report"
338	16	Access to the site is available via two points. The primary access will be through the Mansfield Road frontage with a secondary access through St Anne's Drive. This arrangement has an in principle agreement from Nottinghamshire County Council.
338	17	Landscape: In September 2007 Munro and Whitten Ltd produced a Landscape Assessment and Development Principles document which considered the site (previously provided to the Council). As indicated above the document concluded that "a well considered development will allow the extension of the current urban envelope into the diverse and disjointed urban fringe landscape". This document also included a preliminary master plan showing land on the northern edge of the site proposed as public open space linking with existing open space to the east (Protected Open Space site 2/105 in the current consultation). As the evidence base described above indicates the site has no overriding constraints that would prevent development. This further supports the findings of the Council's SHLAA which found the site to be suitable and achievable and only indicated the site 'may' be available as no planning permission had been gained. William Davis therefore strongly support the allocation of the land to the north of Mansfield Road, which would contribute roughly 250 dwellings towards the 1,517 dwelling residual to be found in Worksop.
338	18	If it is decided that the land north of Mansfield Road is an appropriate location for a required school site I can confirm that this can be accommodated and would not affect overall deliverability of the site. Assuming a requirement for circa 2 hectares of land, it is assumed that 1 hectare (playing fields) could be accommodated in the open space area to the north of the site and 1 hectare within the development area. There would therefore be a reduction in the development capacity of the site from circa 250 to circa 220 dwellings. It is assumed that all allocated housing sites would make a contribution to the costs of providing the school (plus other improvements to education provision required) via CIL. The contribution of the land would therefore be treated as a contribution 'in kind' towards CIL.
339	1	Please note that we do not believe that the developments detailed on the plan referenced as 511, 370, 3, 488 & 489 are appropriate and hence object to the same for the following reasons:
339	2	Access & egress; Although it is unclear on the plan how the additional housing will be accessed I can advise that neither Grove Coach Rd or Bracken Lane are capable of dealing with the increased volume of traffic that would be generated. Grove Coach Rd is frequently single file due to parked cars in situ on both sides of the Rd & the risk to children attending Bracken Lane would be significantly increased.
339	3	Flooding; The area is liable to flooding and in recent history houses have suffered considerable damage resultant from the same. In addition the sites referenced as 488 & 489 are flooded as I write.
339	4	School; Bracken Lane School is full and has always been so.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
340	1	We must oppose the future plans for the development within the village of Clarborough.
340	2	The village can not take the influx of more houses and the increase of its population that goes with it.
340	3	The roads are too narrow to take the increase in traffic, this in turn is a danger to the children who use these roads to travel backwards and forwards to school.
340	4	The drains through-out the village are too small to cope with the population as it is without an increase. To improve this situation would mean major construction at a very high price.
340	5	There are no shops at the present for any type of shopping which would mean a journey into Retford. With no public transport on a Sunday and a limited service throughout the rest of the week, makes travelling to and from a major town difficult if not impossible.
340	6	The schools are not big enough to cope with the pupils we have at the present and to increase the population would only cause a major problem.
340	7	Once again we oppose any building of houses to increase the population of this village. This we feel would cost too much both in money and hardship and ruin the lives of the villagers who have made their homes there.
341	1	I have been a resident in Clarborough for the last ten years, I have two young children who enjoy the quiet village life.
341	2	I very strongly oppose the plans to build up to 93 houses down the road from my house, who is going to buy them?
341	3	1. Big Lane is as it says in its name a Lane, not wide enough to cope with a possible 200 more cars going up and down, last Christmas in the snow was impossible.
341	4	2. Clarborough School itself has no more places, it's a small village school.
341	5	3. Clarborough village has no amenities anymore.
341	6	4. The drains past my house are always blocking up.
341	7	5. The children enjoy playing on the proposed site and many dog walkers use it.
342	1	Contaminated Land - The Issues and Options consultation document is supported and informed by the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). As part of the site selection process the SHLAA under paragraph 14.1 Character of the surrounding area identifies Physical Constraints and Natural factors but no specific mention is made of contaminated land or mine workings / areas of prone to subsidence. However within the Issues and Options document paragraph 2.6 in the site selection methodology identifies the following a) item 15 Ground conditions and Topography b) item 17 Pollution or Contamination c) item 18 Land Stability these being included within the assessment methodology. I would suggest that the sites are not just identified and considered as a discrete unit, but that the zone of influence of such features as landfills, mineshafts, or a colliery spoil tips should be considered and integrated within the site selection procedure. Zones of influence may extend up to and beyond 250m. These compromised zones surrounding the potential "constraint" could be integrated within a possible development by careful alignment of structures and land use i.e. access road, open landscape for the development etc. The formal planning application procedure will ultimately address any site specific concerns relating the contaminated land and no site can be considered beyond developing given application of sufficient technical and financial resource, whether this is sustainable or cost effective is a different matter.
342	2	Landscape The methodology proposed to select sites for consideration in the Preferred Options report addresses landscape issues under Criterion 6: "Will the site impact negatively on Landscape Character?". Using the Bassetlaw District Council Landscape Character Appraisal study, sites are scored 'green', 'amber' or 'red' dependant on their which landscape policy zone they fall into in the Landscape Character Appraisal. A methodology for undertaking landscape character assessment was developed by Nottinghamshire County Council's Landscape and Reclamation Team, based upon Natural England's Landscape Character Guidance (2002). This methodology was produced to update the Nottinghamshire Landscape Guidelines 1998 and to respond to changes in Government legislation (PPS7) which required the greater emphasis on the use of landscape character assessments in informing policy within Local Development Frameworks (LDFs). The landscape character assessment fits national characterisations (as designated by Natural England's 'Character of England Landscape, Wildlife and Cultural Features Map' produced in 2005) and regional characterisations. Bassetlaw District Council produced their own Landscape Character Appraisal using the method devised by NCC. Since the process used to undertake the landscape character assessment was devised by NCC and NCC worked with the BDC staff on it's production, the Landscape and Reclamation team support the use of this document and the Landscape Policy Zone classifications it incorporates to determine site suitability in the Allocations Issues and Options Document. The Landscape and Reclamation team would welcome an opportunity to engage in further discussions with Bassetlaw District Council regarding site allocation and service provision. If you require clarification on contaminated land or landscape, please contact Derek Hair, Principal Project Engineer, Landscape and Reclamation Team.
342	3	35 – This site is partially within the designated conservation area of Gateford and is adjacent to the site of a grade II listed building. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) these designated heritage assets.
342	4	9 – This site is adjacent to the site of two listed buildings, one grade I designated, one grade II. Development in this location would affect (and likely harm) the setting of these designated heritage assets.
342	5	7 – this site is immediately adjacent to a grade II listed building (canal bridge). Access over the canal to a site of this size is likely to damage the fabric or setting of this designated heritage asset. This site also includes a large area of ridge and furrow recorded on the county HER.
342	6	46& 309 – this site covers an large area of ridge and furrow recorded on the county HER.
342	7	37 – this site is opposite the site of a grade II listed building and immediately adjacent to 3 sites identified on the county HER (Bolham Manor, Water pumping station and Mill). Development on this site would be likely to affect (and potentially damage) the setting of a designated heritage asset and several undesigned heritage assets.
342	8	512 – this site is close to the curtilage of a grade II* listed building complex. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of designated heritage assets.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
342	9	345 – this site is adjacent to a listed building and the designated conservation area. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of designated heritage assets.
342	10	10 – this site is recorded on the county HER as containing an industrial buildings of heritage interest. Development on this site would need to consider the reuse of undesignated heritage assets.
342	11	3 & 489 – these sites affect the designated conservation area. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of the designated heritage asset.
342	12	24 – this site contains ridge and furrow recorded on the county HER.
342	13	27 – this site is within the designated conservation area and opposite a grade II listed building. Various undesignated heritage assets are immediately adjacent to the site. This site is close to the curtilage of a grade II* listed building complex. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting and character of designated heritage assets.
342	14	40, 52, 1, 41, 364, 259 & R2 – these sites around the south of Retford are peppered with sites of archaeological interest recorded on the county HER. NCC archaeologists should be consulted to provide more input.
342	15	S1 & R7 – as above.
342	16	259 & R2, S1 & R7 – NCC archaeologists should be consulted to provide more input.
342	17	1/61 - this site is opposite a grade II* listed building complex. Protection as open space may not be the most appropriate type of use with regards to the setting of designated heritage assets. Rural, agricultural use is likely to be the most appropriate type of use with this regard.
342	18	193, 180 and 232 (and to a lesser extent 204) – these sites are within the historic core of Harworth, they are all immediately adjacent to designated listed buildings. Development in these locations would be highly likely to damage the setting of one or more designated heritage asset.
342	19	520 – this site includes grade II listed buildings (North House Farm) and encroaches on the designated conservation area. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of these designated heritage assets.
342	20	124 - this site contains a building identified as an undesignated heritage asset on the county HER. It is also opposite the entrance to the site of the grade ii Listed mill and within the designated conservation area boundary.
342	21	117 – this site contains a building identified as an undesignated heritage asset on the county HER.
342	22	127 – this site is substantially within the designated conservation area and two buildings within the area surrounded by the site are identified as an undesignated heritage assets on the county HER.
342	23	233 – this site is adjacent to a site containing a building identified as an undesignated heritage asset on the county HER.
342	24	235 - this site is within the designated conservation area and adjacent to a site containing a listed building and farm buildings identified as an undesignated heritage assets on the county HER.
342	25	126 – this site is within the designated conservation area and adjacent farm buildings identified as an undesignated heritage assets on the county HER.
342	26	79 and 80 – these sites are adjacent to grade II listed buildings. Development in these locations would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of these designated heritage assets..
342	27	93 & 33/9 and 201 – these sites are recorded on the county HER as containing ridge and furrow fossilized field systems.
342	28	33/9 – these sites are recorded on the county HER as containing ridge and furrow fossilized field systems.
342	29	101 – the HER records earthworks and ridge and furrow in this location.
342	30	106 – is close to the location of Beckingham Station House grade II listed building.
342	31	517 and 590 – these sites are adjacent to the listed farm complex of Mill Farm. Development in these locations would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of the designated heritage assets.
342	32	213 and 214 - these sites are adjacent to the listed historic building complex of Spital House. Development in these locations would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of the designated heritage assets.
342	33	178 – this site is at the entrance to Blyth conservation area and close to the grade I listed church. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of these designated heritage assets.
342	34	171 – this site contains an undesignated heritage asset recorded on the county HER.
342	35	258 – this site is opposite a grade II listed building (Lilly Cottage). Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of this designated heritage asset.
342	36	544 – this site is immediately adjacent to a grade II listed farm complex of Church Farm. Development in this location would affect and most likely harm, the setting of these designated heritage assets.
342	37	478 and 541 these sites are adjacent to listed buildings (grade I and II). Development in this location would affect and very likely harm, the setting of these designated heritage assets. This area also contains earthworks of archaeological interest recorded during the ‘village earthworks survey’.
342	38	398 and 399 – these sites are adjacent to the scheduled ancient monument, grade II and a grade I listed buildings, 398 also falls partly within Cuckney designated conservation area. Development in this location would affect and very likely harm, the setting of these designated heritage assets.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
342	39	303 – this site is not a brownfield site and is presently used for allotments. It is within Cuckney designated conservation area and should be considered for inclusion within the proposed adjacent protected green space.
342	40	60/3, 60/5 and 60/6 are all within the setting of cuckney mill and millpond listed buildings. Identification as protected open space is compatible with protecting the setting of designated heritage assets.
342	41	60/2 – is within Cuckney conservation area and part of the setting of the listed row of cottages on School Lane. Identification as protected open space is compatible with protecting the setting of these designated heritage assets.
342	42	14/3 and 14/1 – although Dunham has no designated conservation area both of these areas are important to the setting of the historic village. 14/3 is adjacent to two grade II listed buildings (Wilmot House and Bridge Inn) and is a key component of their setting. 14/1 ‘The Green’ is an unusual and very rare example of an historic village green in Nottinghamshire, the Notts HER records a number of undesignated heritage assets around it. Identification as protected open space is compatible with protecting the setting of the designated and undesignated heritage assets.
342	43	141 – this site falls partially within the designated conservation area and is adjacent to grade II listed building, the Rosary and undesignated heritage assets recorded on the HER. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of these designated heritage assets.
342	44	525 – this site is immediately opposite the grade II listed Victorian Board School. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of this designated heritage asset.
342	45	16/4 – this open space is part of the curtilage and setting of the listed school. Identification as protected open space is compatible with protecting the setting of this designated heritage asset.
342	46	143 and 523 – these sites are within the designated conservation area. The HER records that 523 contains evidence of ridge and furrow. 143 is at the very entrance of the conservation area. Development in these locations would affect (and potentially harm) the designated heritage asset of the conservation area.
342	47	522 and 524 – these sites are outside of the designated conservation area but development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of this designated heritage asset.
342	48	110 – this site is part of the setting of the undesignated heritage historic farm complex.
342	49	526 and 109 – these sites are either side of the designated conservation area boundary. Development in either location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting and/or character of this designated heritage asset
342	50	145 – this site is immediately adjacent to the conservation area . Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of this designated heritage asset.
342	51	508 & 16/3 – this site is at the core of the designated conservation area. It is unclear how the mix of housing and protected open space would work. It seems unlikely that the site could be developed in a way that successfully achieved the aims of both.
342	52	508 & 16/3 – this site is at the core of the designated conservation area. It is unclear how the mix of housing and protected open space would work. It seems unlikely that the site could be developed in a way that successfully achieved the aims of both.
342	53	246 – this site is the only field recorded on the HER as containing ridge and furrow in the area immediately surrounding the village. If is the best or only example of a fossilised field system, development would not be compatible with the preservation of this undesignated heritage interest.
342	54	407 – this site is immediately adjacent to the grade II listed Hall Farm site, it is also wholly within the boundary of the conservation area. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of these designated heritage assets.
342	55	401 – this site is partially within the designated conservation area. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of this designated heritage asset.
342	56	410 – conservation-led redevelopment of the listed old school site is supported.
342	57	412 and 413 – these sites are within the designated conservation area boundary and are highly visible. To the frontage there is a good survival of historic buildings most of which are recorded on the county HER. Development in these locations would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of the designated and undesignated heritage assets.
342	58	534 - this site is within the conservation area and immediately adjacent to the grade I listed church. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of these designated heritage assets.
342	59	22/3 – this site is part of the setting of Gamston Manor. Identification as protected open space is compatible with protecting the setting of this designated heritage asset.
342	60	22/2 – this site is part of the setting of grade II listed Rectory House. Identification as protected open space is compatible with protecting the setting of this designated heritage asset.
342	61	134 – this site is within the conservation area boundary and adjacent to an area recorded on the HER as containing earthworks of archaeological interest.
342	62	424 – this site is on the edge of the designated conservation area and immediately bounds the grade II listed Church Cottages. Development in this location is highly likely to impact on (with the potential damage) the setting of both designated heritage assets.
342	63	588 – Laurels Farm is recorded as a building of interest on the county HER, it is also within the designated conservation area. Very sensitive conservation led redevelopment of the site would be required.
342	64	256 – this site straddles the recently designated conservation area and is adjacent to a grade II listed building and some undesignated heritage assets also. Development in this location would potentially damage the setting and character of one or more designated heritage asset.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
342	65	252 – this site contains a historic building identified on the HER and is within the conservation area. Development in this location would be highly likely to damage the character of the designated conservation area. The loss of the building to achieve highway access off the A 632 would be damaging to the character of the conservation area.
342	66	540 – this site is adjacent to the designated conservation area and to the site of a grade II listed building (Langwith Lodge). Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of these designated heritage assets.
342	67	262 – this site contains several listed buildings, including a very significant and rare aisled timber-framed barn. It has previously been the subject of an extensive residential conversion and new build development. There is no apparent value in allocating this site as there is no capacity for further development without serious harm to designated heritage assets.
342	68	551 – this site sits immediately between two grade II listed buildings. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of these designated heritage assets.
342	69	501 – this site is adjacent to the grade I listed church. Development in this location would harm the setting of this designated heritage asset.
342	70	162 – the county HER records that this site contains ridge and furrow earthworks, which could/should be treated as an undesignated heritage asset.
342	71	35/2, 35/3 and 35/5 - these sites are all adjacent to listed buildings. Identification as protected open space is compatible with protecting the setting of these designated heritage assets.
342	72	238 – this site is within the zone of visual influence of the designated heritage asset, ruins of South Wheatley Church (scheduled ancient monument), development here could affect (and potentially harm) the setting of a designated heritage asset.
342	73	239 – this site is within the designated conservation area and contains a building identified as an undesignated heritage asset on the county HER.
342	74	483 – this site contains a building of local interest, the farm complex is recorded on the county HER. Residential conversion of the agricultural buildings would need to be ‘conservation led’ otherwise insensitive approach would be likely to damage the significance of this heritage asset.
342	75	230 & 231 – earthworks and archaeological interest is recorded on the county HER in both these plots. Residential development would be likely to damage the significance of this heritage asset.
342	76	228 – the county HER records this site as this containing ridge and furrow, if these remains are visible as earthworks then development would be likely to damage the significance of this heritage asset.
342	77	234 – the county HER records crop mark features in the field adjacent to this site.
342	78	224 – the county HER records crop mark features in this field
342	79	537 – the county HER records a building of heritage interest adjacent to the site. This is a malthouse, appears to have been recently converted to residential (without consultation with NCC conservation).
342	80	462 and 459 – ridge and furrow is recorded on the county HER on these sites.
342	81	463 – this site contains earthworks recorded during the village earthworks survey.
342	82	454 – this site is opposite a grade II listed building. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of this designated heritage asset.
342	83	458 – this sites is adjacent to a grade II listed building and an earthwork complex was recorded during the village earthworks survey. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) these designated heritage asset.
342	84	281- this site is immediately adjacent to a grade I listed parish church and contains earthworks recorded on the county HER. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) these designated heritage assets.
342	85	366, 437, 438, 368, 442, 366 - these sites all contain earthwork complexes identified on the county HER. 366 – is also opposite the site of a grade II listed building.
342	86	286 – this site is adjacent to the grade I listed church and grade II listed buildings. Development in this location would affect (and potentially harm) the setting of designated heritage assets.
343	1	General observations - As a general rule distributing development across many sites rather than concentrating it at a few will also distribute the transport impacts particularly the need for highway mitigation. However there may be advantages for clustering the developments to take advantage of economies of scale e.g. securing a bus service and mixed use sites will also benefit from a proportion of ‘internal’ trip making.
343	2	The Bassetlaw Transport Study (BTS) assumed development distributed across many sites in Worksop and concluded that the main areas requiring highway mitigation were junctions along the A57. This conclusion will need to be rechecked if the quantum and distribution of proposed development now being considered differs significantly from that tested in the BTS.
343	3	Site 35 Ashes Park Avenue. The consultation paper suggests that this site may be suitable for up to 700 dwellings. However this scale of additional development would not be acceptable if accessed solely from Ashes Park Avenue and adjoining culs de sac, due to non compliance with the Council’s highway design standards and requirements.
343	4	Sites 28/W6.Claylands Avenue and sites195, 343/W8 Gateford Rd are potential mixed use sites. These sites benefit from better highway accessibility to the strategic road network than sites 4, 39, W9, W10 which are situated to the north and east of Worksop. As a general rule sites accessed directly from the A57 corridor should be preferred over sites situated more remotely from the SRN.
343	5	Site 4/W9 Land east of Worksop (paragraph 4.11 page 27 of the consultation paper). Four possible development options are considered in the consultation paper, observations on each as follows;

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
343	6	Option 1. Figure 4.2. This is the most comprehensive mixed use proposal and occupies the entire site area. For a development of this scale major transport infrastructure would be required to accommodate the transport demands, including a new link road connecting the A57 to the south with the B6045 to the north. Employment accessibility, particularly HGVs, will need to be limited to and from the A57. Separating the proposed residential and existing residential development with open space would not be favoured from a transport sustainability perspective. The new development needs to be integrated with the old.
343	7	Options 2 and 3. Careful thought would need to be given to the internal layout such that residential and employment traffic are separated. Commercial traffic passing through the residential area would not be acceptable. A layout, similar to site 39, with both residential and commercial development having a frontage and separate access to the B6045 would be preferable. The impacts on the B6045 and surrounding local roads would need further consideration for this scale of development, significant off site mitigation could be warranted particularly at major traffic intersections.
343	8	Option 4. The impacts on the B6045 and surrounding local roads would need further consideration for this scale of development, significant off site mitigation could be warranted particularly at major traffic intersections. The co location of proposed new development and existing residential development would need to be reconsidered for reasons of transport sustainability.
343	9	Residential development sites identified to the north and east of Retford (figure 5.1) are more accessible to the Town centre and its services by all modes of travel than sites to the south (Ordsall). In transport terms sites to the north and east would be preferable to sites to the south of the town.
343	10	The potential employment site R7 is far more accessible than site R2. In fact it is not clear whether an acceptable access could be formed to serve site R2 on account of the remote location and juxtaposition with potential residential development.
343	11	There are existing traffic capacity problems at junctions on the B6463 Main Street through Harworth. Although the redevelopment of the colliery will include some junction improvements this part of the highway network is unlikely to be able to cope with any further significant development traffic. With the scope for further traffic capacity improvements along the B6463 limited by existing land and property constraints it would be advisable if the majority of proposed new residential development were situated to the north and east of the village (where additional traffic could be more readily accommodated) rather than along the western fringe of Harworth.
343	12	An improvement to the Scrooby Road/ A614 junction will be necessary.
343	13	I can confirm that sites (W1, W12, W13) are in suitable locations in terms of access to the A57 and the wider strategic road network. All subject to satisfactory details of access and we will require a Transport Assessments.
343	14	Notwithstanding the above, site W12 is very constrained in terms of access in that there are two low bridges between the site and the A57. However, both are above 4.0m which would accommodate a standard articulated lorry. The B6079 Retford Road from which the sit would be served isn't particularly wide and lacks footways. It is difficult to see how this could be addressed to the west of the site given the width constraint of the bridge abutments and the need for land up to the roundabout in order to provide a reasonable connection to the A57 via the B6040. I'm not sure whether access could otherwise be achieved through Manton Wood Enterprise Park but there is still the issue as to how to get across the railway line.
344	1	General / strategic - While it says that 'suitable applications' will be supported paragraph 2.10 does not make it clear how future proposals for economic development outside of Worksop, Retford and Harworth-Bircotes will be assessed. Explicit reference to Policies DM1-3 in the Core Strategy would be appropriate. It is clear, also, that sites other than those in or near to the three main settlements may be allocated, for at least mixed-use including employment uses.
344	2	Strategic - Currently the NPPF proposes that a 20% over-provision (against estimated need, undefined at present) should be planned for. How to deal with this will need consideration before the preferred option document is produced.
344	3	Developer contributions & infrastructure - The ability to deliver or assist efficient provision of infrastructure is not included as a criterion in the assessment of sites. While the identification of the potential need for infrastructure is referred to in a later section there is potential to decide on suitable sites dependant upon their suitability in delivering infrastructure, or minimising the need for additional infrastructure. For example, additional capacity in schools or on highways could be utilised instead of selecting sites where capacity is limited. While less likely to be significant in the selection of sites within settlements, nevertheless such a factor should be considered. This consideration should apply to transport, education, water & sewerage and flood provision as well as green infrastructure.
344	4	Highways - All sites, once allocated at the preferred options stage will need, individually and in combination, to be subject to the submission and findings of a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. Consequently comments concerning transport at this stage relate principally to the methodology proposed to decide sites. In terms of constraints on any proposed site the answer very much depends on the scale of development proposed on that site and with other sites in combination.
344	5	The transport study supporting the Core Strategy assumes a specific quantum and distribution of development. In transport terms the broad strategic impacts for this quantum are recorded. The task now is to establish how (or whether) the outcome of the current stage differs from the CS evidence base and the significance of any difference on the capacity of the transport network to accommodate alternate growth scenarios.
344	6	For all settlements the capacity and number of potential sites are greater than the required provision established in the Core Strategy. The potential capacity for each named site and the potential options for the mix of uses on mixed-use sites give many permutations and combinations which would deliver the Core Strategy's requirements, and more importantly could differ quite significantly from the scenario tested in the Bassetlaw Transport Study. For example the Council could seek to distribute the development among a minimum number of sites or all on a single site in any settlement. If all development were to take place on a single site this could have disproportionate impacts on the supporting transport infrastructure.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
344	7	Consequently County Council officers will seeking further guidance and require close liaison with Bassetlaw over responses from the County as Local Highway Authority especially in terms of individual and combined sites taken forward to the next, preferred option stage.
344	8	Ecology - The Site Allocation Screening Methodology outlined in Section 2 of the consultation document appears sound from a nature conservation perspective. It is noted that a number of sites have already been screened out of the issues and options stage, as part of the SHLAA assessment process. This process considered, amongst other things, constraints posed by SSSIs, protected species, and Local Wildlife Sites (SINCs).
344	9	It is noted that following completion of this consultation, further site assessment will be undertaken to identify a preferred set of sites for consideration in the Preferred Options report. One of the assessment criteria is “will the development detract from or enhance the existing Green Infrastructure of the settlement or neighbourhood?” This should ensure that designated wildlife sites are considered, given that they are a fundamental component of Green Infrastructure. However, there may be a danger that other, non-designated areas (such as areas of UKBAP or LBAP habitat) may be overlooked in this process.
344	10	Archaeology & Heritage - A separate document itemises sites with archaeological interest of various levels of potential. It is recommended that this is incorporated in any screening process. The sites of most significance are identified also in the response below. A full list will be sent with this response.
344	11	Many sites have archaeological remains associated with them, or the potential for their discovery. Consequently in almost all cases development will need to be preceded by investigation and as necessary fieldwalking or geophysics evaluation, Strip, Map and Sample procedure, and other investigation, recording or preservation.
344	12	Heritage assets are affected by a number of potential sites to a greater or lesser extent. A separate document listing sites which have heritage issues is in preparation and will be sent with the response. This will be followed up by liaison by the County’s heritage officer over decisions prior to the preferred option stage. It is important that impacts upon heritage assets are appropriately investigated before final decisions are made so that their significance is understood and accounted for.
344	13	Flood Risk - The County Council will not be commenting at this stage on these sites as a Lead Local Flood Authority. However, the future enactment of Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act (2010) and the future role of the County Council as a SUDS Approving Body means that surface water drainage proposals for these sites would need to be in line with National Standards and approved and then adopted by the County Council. Any site allocation proposals by Bassetlaw should reflect future changes to the planning system in this respect. As Lead Local Flood Authority, the County Council also wishes to highlight that powers to do work to manage flood risk from surface water and groundwater might be tied into future development and infrastructure development/ improvements. This may have implications for developer contributions for example towards any Community Infrastructure Levy."
344	14	Landscape and contaminated land - As part of the site selection process the SHLAA identifies physical constraints. No specific mention is made of contaminated land or mine workings / areas of prone to subsidence. However within the Issues and Options document paragraph 2.6 in the site selection methodology identifies the ground conditions, topography, contamination and land stability being included within the assessment methodology. The sites should not just be identified and considered as a discrete unit, but the zone of influence of such features as landfills, mineshafts, or colliery spoil tips should be integrated within the site selection procedure. Zones of influence may extend up to and beyond 250m. These compromised zones surrounding the potential “constraint “could be integrated within a possible development by careful alignment of structures and land use i.e. access road, open landscape for the development etc. The formal planning application procedure will ultimately address any site specific concerns and it should be remembered that no site can be considered beyond developing given application of sufficient technical and financial resource. Since the process used to undertake the landscape character assessment was devised by NCC and NCC worked with the BDC staff on its production, the Landscape and Reclamation team support the use of this document and the Landscape Policy Zone classifications it incorporates to determine site suitability in the Allocations Issues and Options Document. The Landscape and Reclamation team would welcome an opportunity to engage in further discussions with Bassetlaw District Council regarding site allocation and service provision.
344	15	Grasslands (sites in various villages) - In addition, a large number of potential sites are located on areas of grassland (meadow or pasture) within or around settlements, which are not covered by any form of nature conservation designation. Species-rich grasslands are some of our most important sites, but are under severe threat (for example, we have experienced a 97% loss of hay meadows since the 1930’s), and valuable sites may not necessarily have been picked up through the SINC process (e.g. due to lack of landowner permission for access to undertake surveys). These grassland sites have been examined on aerial photos, looking at things such as sward variability and the presence of features suggesting longevity of habitat (e.g. ridge and furrow), in an attempt to identify what may be areas of semi-improved (and possibly species-rich) grassland that could be of nature conservation value. However, it should be noted that aerial photo interpretation is an inexact science, and therefore it is likely that some areas of species-poor, improved grassland (of low biodiversity value) have been flagged up in this process. It is also possible that other areas of grassland that do have nature conservation value have been overlooked. In any event, it is suggested that several sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development; these are mentioned in the settlement listing above.
344	16	35 – this Potential Housing site overlaps with the Nab’s Ashes Wood SINC 2/116 (also Ancient Woodland), and lies immediately adjacent to Whipman Wood SINC 5/2318 and Owday Plantation SINC 2/114. The site boundary should be amended to remove overlap with the Nab’s Ashes Wood SINC, and it should be ensured that there is mitigation to prevent disturbance to these woodland SINCs from the pressure of more people using them for recreation. There should also be a physical stand-off between the development and the woodlands.
344	17	30 – this Potential Housing site lies immediately adjacent to Lady Lee Quarry SINC 1/45, and development of this area is likely to have a negative impact on the site due to proximity and increased disturbance. There are also historical records of great crested newt from Lady Lee Quarry, and if still present, the rough grassland surrounding the site would act as terrestrial habitat for this species, which would require mitigation. It is therefore suggested that the suitability of this site cannot be determined without further information about the ecological value of the land in question.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number	Answer	
Respondent	Comment	
344	18	38 - this Potential Housing site covers two small areas of woodland in its southern arms. These should be protected from development, and incorporated within the Protected Open Space 2/128.
344	19	45 - this Potential Housing site is located upon what appears to be an area of established rough grassland with scrub which may have biodiversity value. It is suggested that this area would merit further investigation before it can be concluded as being appropriate for development.
344	20	W13 – this Potential Employment site sits adjacent to the River Ryton, which forms an important east-west corridor through Worksop. Any development on this site should seek to retain and enhance this function, through an appropriate stand-off and habitat creation.
344	21	4 & W9 – this Potential Mixed Use site should be laid out in such a way that it contributes to the local green infrastructure network. In option 1, it is suggested that the existing open space provision is relocated along the eastern boundary of the site, and designed to maximise its biodiversity value so that it can act as a wildlife corridor up the eastern side of Worksop. Black Hill Clump should be retained within the development, and linked to surrounding countryside through a green corridor.
344	22	30 – this Potential Housing site lies immediately adjacent to Lady Lee Quarry SINC 1/45, and development of this area is likely to have a negative impact on the site due to proximity and increased disturbance. There are also historical records of great crested newt from Lady Lee Quarry, and if still present, the rough grassland surrounding the site would act as terrestrial habitat for this species, which would require mitigation. It is therefore suggested that the suitability of this site cannot be determined without further information about the ecological value of the land in question.
344	23	38 - this Potential Housing site covers two small areas of woodland in its southern arms. These should be protected from development, and incorporated within the Protected Open Space 2/128.
344	24	45 - this Potential Housing site is located upon what appears to be an area of established rough grassland with scrub which may have biodiversity value. It is suggested that this area would merit further investigation before it can be concluded as being appropriate for development.
344	25	Sites 4 & W9 have a wide range of archaeological potential; there needs to be survey, evaluation, appropriate mitigation.
344	26	Site 35 contains extensive crop marks and thus parts of the site may warrant preservation in situ. Recommend survey, evaluation and appropriate mitigation. •
344	27	2/122 – it is suggested that this Protected Open Space should be extended east along the Chesterfield Canal, as far as the railway bridge, in recognition of the important corridor of open wetland habitat that this area forms.
344	28	7, 46, 309 - these Potential Housing sites abut the Longholme Pasture, East Retford SINC 2/633. Any development on these sites would have to mitigate potential proximity and disturbance impacts on this SINC.
344	29	6, 7, 69 - these Potential Housing sites abut the Chesterfield Canal (Shireoaks to Welham) SINC 2/621 (which becomes the Chesterfield Canal SSSI adjacent to Site 7). Any development on these sites would have to mitigate potential proximity and disturbance impacts on this SINC, and address potential hydrological or water quality impacts.
344	30	69 - this Potential Housing site abuts the East Retford Marshy Grasslands SINC 2/997. Any development on this site would have to mitigate potential proximity and disturbance impacts on this SINC, and address potential hydrological impacts.
344	31	Site 364 contains crop marks of enclosures with a high Archaeological potential. Recommend survey, evaluation and appropriate mitigation.
344	32	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: 7, 46, 69, 309
344	33	184 - this Potential Housing site has recently been identified as part of a candidate Local Wildlife Site - Snipe Park Wood SINC 5/2279. It is an established area of scrub and grassland and should be identified as Protected Open Space, linking Snipe Park through to open countryside to the north (see next comments), either as an extension to 61/13 or to 61/20.
344	34	192 – this Potential Housing site covers an area of established grassland and scrub/young woodland. It is not covered by any nature conservation designations, but may have ecological interest and acts as part of a corridor between Snipe Park and open countryside to the north. It is suggested this area could be identified as Protected Open Space as an extension to 61/7
344	35	187 - this Potential Housing site abuts the Whitehouse Plantation SINC 2/570. Any development at this site should mitigate potential proximity and disturbance impacts on this SINC, and seek to ensure that green corridors retain its links to the surrounding countryside. There may be opportunities for habitat creation as part of any development which facilitate this.
344	36	H4 – this Potential Employment site abuts the recently designated Coronation Clump Sandpit SINC 5/2280. Any development at this site should mitigate potential proximity and disturbance impacts on this SINC.
344	37	Sites 180 and 193 are within the Medieval village core and warrants a Strip, map and sample (SMS) approach.
344	38	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: 187, 180, 204, 206, 232.
344	39	219, 385 – the latter site abuts, and the former lies in close proximity to, the Dyscarr Wood SINC 1/46 and SSSI. Any development at this site should mitigate potential proximity and disturbance impacts on this SINC. In addition, it is not clear why this northern section of Dyscarr Wood is excluded from the Protected Open Space 62/3, which covers the southern part of the wood.
344	40	Sites 197, 520, 176 all have evidence of crop marks on adjacent land with a high Archaeological potential; evaluation and appropriate mitigation are advised.
344	41	122 - this Potential Housing site is located upon what appears to be an area of established rough grassland with scrub which may have biodiversity value. It is suggested that this area would merit further investigation before it can be concluded as being appropriate for development.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
344	42	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: 114, 123, 124, 126, 127, 130, 235.
344	43	89, 93 & 33/9, 201 - these Potential Housing/Potential Mixed Use sites abut the Chesterfield Canal (Welham to Misterton) SINC 1/82 (which is also part of the Chesterfield Canal SSSI adjacent to Site 89). Any development on these sites would have to mitigate potential proximity and disturbance impacts on this SINC, and address potential hydrological or water quality impacts.
344	44	Site 201 contains Roman remains within site, Site 91 is close to Roman road, has finds in the area and crop mark evidence from land adjacent. Recommend survey, evaluation and appropriate mitigation.
344	45	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: 87 & M3, 86, 89, 201, 202.
344	46	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: 106, 107, 496.
344	47	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: 266, 369, 482, 590.
344	48	173, 160, 161, 258 - these Potential Housing sites abut the Chesterfield Canal (Welham to Misterton) SINC 1/82 (which is also part of the Chesterfield Canal SSSI adjacent to Site 89). Any development on these sites would have to mitigate potential proximity and disturbance impacts on this SINC, and address potential hydrological or water quality impacts.
344	49	Site 160 contains earthworks, including ridge and furrow with a high Archaeological potential. The better preserved areas of R&F should be considered for preservation. The site requires survey, evaluation, appropriate mitigation.
344	50	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: 160, 161, 170, 173, 478, 541.
344	51	Site 398 is close to the castle site with a high Archaeological potential. There needs to be evaluation, appropriate mitigation.
344	52	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: 303, 398.
344	53	142 - this Potential Housing site is located upon an area of remnant orchard. Traditional Orchards are a UKBAP habitat, and it is suggested that this area would merit further investigation before it can be concluded as being appropriate for development.
344	54	109, 526 - these Potential Housing sites abut/lie in proximity to the East Markham Marshy Grassland SINC 2/437. Any development on these sites would have to mitigate potential proximity and disturbance impacts on this SINC, and address potential hydrological impacts.
344	55	Site 152 has Roman finds close by, suggesting Roman settlement in the area and a high Archaeological potential. There needs to be evaluation, appropriate mitigation.
344	56	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: 109, 141, 143, 152, 486, 491, 503, 522, 523, 524, 526.
344	57	Sites 247, 248, 249 all have evidence of crop marks on adjacent land, Site 246 has Ridge & Furrow markings, all with a high Archaeological potential; evaluation and appropriate mitigation are advised.
344	58	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: Elkesley - 246, 247
344	59	Site 194 contains crop marks of Roman field system, and possible settlement enclosure, site 192 contains part of site of deserted medieval village both with very high Archaeological potential. Site 191 contains significant archaeological issues - crop mark evidence suggests site contains extensive remains of probable Roman date. There needs to be survey, evaluation, appropriate mitigation on all these sites.
344	60	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: Everton - 400, 401, 407
344	61	Site 534 is at the heart of the Medieval village and warrants a Strip, map and sample (SMS) approach. Site 412 has significant well preserved earthworks, possibly part of a manorial complex where the earthworks may warrant preservation in situ. Site 413 also has indications of earthworks. Both would require survey, evaluation and appropriate mitigation.
344	62	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: Gamston - 412, 413
344	63	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: Gringley-on-the-Hill - 135
344	64	Site 423 is adjacent to the River Idle with a wide range of potential archaeological issues; there needs to be survey, evaluation, appropriate mitigation.
344	65	Site 428 contains crop mark evidence for settlement and prehistoric funerary monuments and thus parts of the site may warrant preservation in situ. Recommend survey, evaluation and appropriate mitigation.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
344	66	Site 557 contains finds from prehistoric to Medieval in the area indicating a range of archaeological remains are likely. Recommend survey, evaluation and appropriate mitigation.
344	67	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development:
344	68	Sites 383, 480, 504, 505 & 506 contain finds from prehistoric to Medieval in the area indicating a range of archaeological remains are likely. There needs to be survey, evaluation, appropriate mitigation on all these sites.
344	69	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: Misson - 504, 505, 506
344	70	251 - this Potential Housing site is located upon what appears to be an area of established rough grassland with scrub which may have biodiversity value. It is suggested that this area would merit further investigation before it can be concluded as being appropriate for development.
344	71	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: North Leverton - 162, 165, 262, 501, 551
344	72	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: North Wheatley - 238, 239, 464
344	73	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: Rampton - 228, 231
344	74	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: Ranskill - 157, 537
344	75	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: Sturton-le-Steeple - 462
344	76	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: Sutton-cum-Lound - 275, 281, 299, 536
344	77	Site 445 contains earthworks, including ridge and furrow with a high Archaeological potential. The better preserved areas of R&F should be considered for preservation. The site requires survey, evaluation, appropriate mitigation.
344	78	Because of potential value as grassland (see 'Other comments' below) the following sites would merit further investigation before they can be concluded as being appropriate for development: Walkeringham - 286, 293, 366, 437, 438, 442, 445
345	1	No I do not agree, I cannot see what benefits additional housing and employment would provide, over and above what is required.
345	2	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
345	3	We already have a large enough development in Gateford which has its own problems as it is. How would the traffic get out onto the A57? Where would the access road be? It is already difficult to get out of the estate by car onto the A57, especially in the mornings when people are trying to get to work, causing long lines of traffic building up. The potential development would increase this significantly. Increased traffic would put our children in more danger than they already are. There are no speed restrictions on the roads to remind drivers of speed limits in built up areas, hence we already suffer speeding cars slamming breaks on at the last minute approaching junctions.
345	4	Have the council considered the strain more housing would put on our already strained public services e.g.: schools, GP practices, our local hospital?
345	5	The problems we already encounter with bored young people getting up to mischief because facilities for them in the immediate area are non existent would potentially increase.
345	6	The people of Gateford have only, in the last few years been completely free from the years of mess on the roads and the continual noise from building traffic whilst the development was completed.
345	7	I do strongly think that the area 35 should not be used for building and should be protected. (see question 3)
345	8	Building on this piece of land would destroy Valuable agricultural land, destroy beautiful countryside, hedgerows, woodlands and therefore have a detrimental effect on our wildlife.
345	9	Also public footpaths and bridleways would no longer be available for the walkers who frequently enjoy this lovely countryside.
345	10	Consider the density of housing the development in plan 35 would create joined onto the already large Gateford development. With density comes pollution, are we not trying to promote 'green' values.
345	11	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
345	12	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
345	13	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
345	14	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
345	15	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
345	16	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
345	17	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
345	18	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
346	1	I am strongly opposed to any future development of location 35 for housing or employment and in my opinion, location 35 is NOT suitable for further development.
346	2	I do not believe that the local infrastructure could cope with the impact of such a development. Local traffic is already a problem particularly at peak times with the main road through the Gateford estate being frequently used as a short cut to the A57. Traffic congestion at local shops and amenities would significantly increase, posing greater risk to children and the elderly within the locality
346	3	The local school(s)and health centres/ Doctors surgeries would be oversubscribed, leading to further significant deterioration in quality of life of those already living in a 'deprived' area.
346	4	Location 35 should be protected from future development. It is currently used as agricultural land and provides a recreational outdoor space that is enjoyed by many local people, not just those from the immediate Gateford estate. It is an area of natural beauty and development on this site would adversely affect the precious habitat for local wildlife in and around Owday and Whipman Woods and destroy precious countryside.
347	1	I object to further housing on green land in Worksop.
347	2	The area is over developed and future housing would over run schools traffic lost views road damage etc.
348	1	I feel that location 35 is unsuitable for further development.
348	2	We moved to the current estate 7 years ago, because of its quiet location and easy access to woodland walks.
348	3	There are already issues regarding exiting Ashes Park Avenue onto Gateford Road during rush hour times.
348	4	Puddleducks preschool is having to relocate (not yet known where) from St Johns Primary because the school needs the space.
348	5	Gateford Park is not a large enough school to accommodate an influx this large, and has no significant outdoor space for its children.
348	6	The value of existing housing would decrease significantly with such an increase of housing as is proposed, and the area would lose it's current natural attractiveness.
348	7	The fields proposed are currently actively used for agriculture, and I feel that they should remain so.
348	8	Open spaces should be protected. Worksop already lacks free to access open spaces, for those not fortunate enough to be able to afford Clumber.
348	9	I think the area to the south of Worksop between Retford road and kilton is the most suitable location for a large property build.
349	1	I am writing to express concern over the potential plans for housing developments on the site between Broad Gores in Clarborough. My main concerns are as follows: 1) School places. Clarborough Primary School had a total rebuild two years ago and, I believe, is already over-subscribed. To build an extra 90+ houses has the potential to leave 100+ children unable to attend their local primary school, unless a sufficient re-development of the school was reviewed in order to add more school places. Is this something the Council really want to invest in considering the cost incurred a of full rebuild only two years ago?
349	2	Another concern regarding the school is the safety concerns of parking at the school. Already, the access on Hill View Drive is insufficient, with cars blocking residents drives on a daily basis due to parking limitations on the cul-de-sac. This is a safety risk to the school at present when children are going to and leaving school.
349	3	2) Access. If Broad Gores was to be 'joined' with a through-road, this would massively add to traffic flow down Big Lane, which is already not a wide stretch of road. I believe it would also create a 'rat-run' for people wanting to bypass the main street in the village. A regular problem at Welham Bridge is large lorries getting 'stuck' and having to turn round. Would lorries then be cutting through Big Lane to get to Smeath Lane in order to get to Retford?
349	4	3) Lack of shops and employment opportunities. Currently, there is no shop or post office operating in Clarborough since the closure of the shop on Main Street some time ago. I believe this has already caused problems for the elderly residents/infirm of the village. I am not sure at this stage what type of houses are to be built, but if social housing is to be considered, or pensioners bungalows, this could create an added problem for even more residents. There are relatively few businesses operating in Clarborough, so employment opportunities are extremely limited.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
349	5	4) Flooding and drainage. During the summer of 2007, Clarborough was one of the villages affected the most by the flooding. The properties on Big Lane were almost all flooded, with residents having to 'evacuate' their properties. Some of the properties have only just finished being renovated. It seems that no systems have been put in place to address this issue should it happen again. The land on Broad Gores was waterlogged and, thankfully for us, seemed to soak up the water from the flooding beck. If there had been houses on the site, then the flooding problem would no doubt had resulted in all of the 90 homes being flooded too. Drainage seems to be a constant problem on Broad Gores and St Johns Drive. Anglian Water vans seem to be a regular feature on our street!
350	1	Option A
350	2	We would suggest that most if not all new development should be centred around all main centres of existing towns to minimise the costs to the environment, Council and individuals. This will make best use of existing infrastructure and amenities whilst maintaining and protecting the green belt.
350	3	If this application is granted then we would feel very strongly that any further planning permissions not be granted on any other green field sites within Clarborough and Hayton. The corner Farm site should allow existing road and public transport links to be used without the need for any additional requirements thereby keeping additional costs to the community to a minimum.
350	4	None, for the reasons given in the response to question 46 above.
350	5	None.
350	6	Existing sites.
350	7	As above.
350	8	None
351	1	Criterion 1: Is the local community supportive of the development of the site? The public consultation session at Sutton and the Parish Plan clearly demonstrate that the villagers do not want to see further development in the village so will this be adhered to?
351	2	Criterion 2: Will development of the site be compatible with existing and/or potential neighbouring land uses? Criterion 6: Will the site impact negatively on Landscape Character? and Criterion 7: Will the development detract from or enhance the existing built character of the settlement or neighbourhood? The BDC Planning Team members present at the Public Consultation at Sutton Village Hall, December 5th, were adamant that the council will not have any control over what type of properties builders decide to erect so this makes a mockery of these 3 criterion.
351	3	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
351	4	I disagree. I have lived in the village for 25 years and in that time over 25 properties have been built and there are 4 more currently being built - 3 on the land at the back of Long Acre and one on Portland Place. This equates to 4 so plan fulfilled already!! I disagree.
351	5	The village has a range of accommodation including a housing estate on Portland place with council properties as well as private.
351	6	Our Parish Plan clearly indicates that villagers do not want to see further development.
351	7	If villagers views and feelings are ignored and the allocation goes ahead my preferred sites would be 281 and 282. These would cause least disruption and preserve our green open spaces (sites 276 and 299)
351	8	Though the current proposal is for 4 houses I am extremely concerned about the maximum potential capacity houses stated for the 'Potential housing site references.' The figures for sites 274, 276 and 299 are absolutely ludicrous and would result in crammed housing estates.
351	9	I do not understand how potential builders will be allowed to build what ever types of houses they want to when the rest are of are restricted to what we can and can't do in terms of our properties and how they look?!
351	10	Yes I think it is incredibly important to maintain the open spaces. However I am concerned at the miniscule amount of open space defined as potentially protected.
351	11	No. We already have a site at Daneshill which has been there for years.
351	12	We already have a site at Daneshill which has been there for years.
352	1	The only area where (youth services) may have a significant interest is Worksop where there appears to be the potential for one major development. In this instance we would want to offer Youth Service provision either through our existing fixed provision (Valley Young People's Centre, on Stanley Road or the Youth zone at Worksop Library), or through mobile provision if a needs assessment indicated that we should make this a priority area."
353	1	I am writing to you to raise my concerns over the proposal to build new housing in Clarborough on two sites listed as 170 and 258 in the Bassetlaw district local development framework document. I grew up in the village and have moved back after serving in the army, so believe I have a good understanding of the area.
353	2	In recent years the local shop, post office and petrol station have all closed. This means a trip of three miles into Retford for any essentials which is difficult for those without transport as the bus services are poor. With only two stops on the main road this can also mean a long walk with shopping or an expensive taxi ride.
353	3	The telephone service is poor with low quality lines and some of the slowest broad band services in the country. Increasing the number of homes using the services with the rise in contention rates can only make the situation worse
353	4	Water quality where I live on St 10hns Drive is so poor that we have to filter all used for drinking. Again increasing the number of homes in the village is likely to increase problems
353	5	Access into the estate is restricted via a small lane. Increasing the amount of commuters would cause congestion.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
353	6	We have frequent transport issues in the village with the main road flooding at the end of Big Lane and access to Retford being blocked by over height vehicles becoming stuck at the railway bridge on a regular basis. During the snows last winter, none of the side roads in the village received any attention, meaning that most of the village were trapped.
353	7	During my own schooling in the village, we had separate infant and primary schools. Both schools have recently closed and have been replaced by one smaller one. This school is presently at full capacity with no room for extra children the development would bring.
353	8	The following points are raised in your own documents: Both sites are on a flood plain. Building on either puts properties at a risk of flood damage and increases risk of adjoining properties due to loss of natural soak away for run off. Both sites are Sites of Special Scientific Interest (with 170 also being a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation).
353	9	Your document states that the sites have 'good access'. As access can only be achieved via a small lane either side, I cannot see how this can be true
353	10	The document states that site 258 is wasteland with previous use unknown. Since my childhood. I remember this field being rented out to a local farmer to grow crops by the council (over forty years) I find it very hard to believe that Bassetlaw council does not know it did this as it is only very recently that Arthur Lackson became unable to farm the land.
353	11	Considering both sites are Sites of Special Scientific Interest (170 also designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation), on a flood plain, with difficult access and almost no amenities locally I believe that the two are totally unsuitable for use as developments
354	1	Yes I do but not in a green belt space which is used by lot of people to escape the housing development already there area 35 should never be taken and used for housing
354	2	Location 35 the gateford site this is unsuitable to be made into housing as it is the area is already over run with traffic and this area is the only bit of escape from the housing already there.
354	3	This is used by many walkers dog walkers and runners and will take away this bit of rural area we have here totally unsuitable to build on this plot
354	4	Yes area 35 it is lovely green belt land which gives the already full housing estate some respite from noise traffic and a safe place to walk run etc.
355	1	Sorry, I'm not totally sure at the moment.
355	2	This is a difficult question to answer as I am not sure of the current required growth of a town the size of Worksop, and the implications of increasing housing without seeing evidence of demand. I think you, Bassetlaw District Council, are in a better position to advise if this proposal is sustainable, and why.
355	3	39, W10, 4, W9, 8, 35, W12, W1, 9, 11, 14, 15, 60, 75, 23, 567, 569 & 568 The reason I have highlighted these sites only is because I feel most are an addition to an already developed area, so not causing a serious character change within adjacent surroundings. Furthermore, developing these areas will still maintain the charm of Worksop Town without hopefully upsetting too many locals.
355	4	I think the potential employment sites already highlighted on the map (No. W13, W12 & W1) seem well positioned, offering good transportation links within close proximity.
355	5	The only site I would question purely from an aesthetics point of view is W12. This site looks rather close to the Chesterfield canal. Would this spoil the surrounding country side and the enjoyment of possible users of the canal, especially as regards to noise/smell pollution?
355	6	Personally, I'm not totally convinced of a mixed-use site. I sure they may work in some areas but I am convinced given the option, any potential buyer of a property will always prefer a plot away from factories, offices, outlets and schools etc. So, with this in mind, it may be wise to limit the split in favour of housing or separate them altogether. Is it possible for you to suggest some local examples of where this has been successful?
355	7	Yes. Generally analysing the map, you have obviously highlighted sites for localised reasons so I cannot really comment on them without knowing the area well.
355	8	I have, however noticed potential development 35 encroaches on Nab's Ashes Wood. I do feel strongly this should be avoided, as apart from the obvious benefits of woods, trees also help to offset localised flooding which we may well need more now than ever.
355	9	OK. You may or may not be aware I am a resident of Shireoaks. And with this comes personal knowledge of the area, and how it was 25 years ago, and how the village is developing today. Most changes I have seen over the years have been positive and we as a village seem to be 'just' holding onto our uniqueness. I know of many people who visit our village from surrounding areas and do so purely for the treats this village offers. Some say it's for tranquillity, others, the rural/historical walks. Everyone I know enjoys Shireoaks in their own way and for what it represents now. I and my family enjoy Shireoaks for its small size, the rural qualities, and the chesterfield canal just to mention a few.
355	10	This leads me onto the development of Shireoaks. If pushed, there maybe one or two plots i.e. No. 26 28 & W6, that could work well and not have a detrimental effect on our village. I am though, very concerned as regards to the other development proposals earmarked for Shireoaks on the west side of the bypass.
355	11	Considering the proximity of our village the development proposals highlighted on the map seem grossly oversized in percentage terms compared to other parts of Worksop. For example, if you were to tally-up all the proposals for Shireoaks including No. 26, 28 & W6, I am sure it would surpass in size any one singular development site within Worksop apart from 4 & W9.
355	12	I cannot understand why Shireoaks has potentially been given the Lion's share of development, which will without doubt, be the end of the last true village in essence, adjacent to Worksop.
355	13	Option A
355	14	This question is difficult to answer as I am unsure where the existing sites are located on the map, and thus unaware of the consequences of further development.
355	15	I'm not sure of the pros and cons of either way. Question. Is it possible for you to research where these sites are currently located in neighbouring authorities and obtain information as regards to their success or failure? This information would be very useful in aiding us make the right decision.
356	1	No, i feel that you just look for open spaces in small villages where you think you can just build new houses, but without proper consideration of the impact new houses/more traffic will have on the area!
356	2	Option A

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
356	3	I agree that Clarborough & Hayton could have 12 new houses built.
356	4	No, i strongly feel that the area would not be able to cope with more than 12 new houses.
356	5	Site 171 only - 12 new houses
356	6	Since September 2011 Clarborough Primary School has had to make a new classroom in the corridor to accommodate the number of children attending the school. Imagine the number of insufficient child places the school will have if new houses are built and families move into them! Your idea that you could potentially build a total of 228 new houses within Clarborough & Hayton would mean a substantial increase in school places needed which the new school could not possibly accommodate.
356	7	To build new houses on sites 170 and 258 would dramatically increase the traffic flow on Broad Gores resulting in our children being put at risk. Traffic at present through Clarborough is horrendous, especially Smeath Lane, traffic is excessive and people drive down there at such speed. I personally have had several near misses with both lorries and cars on the bends as they drive over the central line due to the road being so narrow!
356	8	Clarborough doesn't have anything to offer potential new home owners/new tenants, apart from a very good but small Primary School.
356	9	We have no shop anymore which is very inconvenient for a lot of residents and one small public house.
356	10	We have frequent power cuts which would increase if more houses were built.
356	11	Feel strongly that the crime rate would increase in the area if more people move into the village!
356	12	Protected
356	13	REMOVED
356	14	REMOVED
357	1	We live on Richmond Road directly opposite Carr Hill school on Tiln Lane, and experience severe traffic congestion at school times, and therefore the further building of dwellings would obviously increase this problem which could further endanger pedestrians and children.
357	2	We already have a number of heavy duty vehicles using Tiln Lane to avoid the low bridge at Clarborough, which would further add to this problem. Is it the intention of Bassetlaw Council to alleviate this problem by building a suitable bypass to avoid the bridge at Clarborough
357	3	Living on the edge of town we feel this area would definitely be spoilt with the building of so many new houses, taking up essential green belt land used for agriculture.
357	4	In our opinion the town of Retford would need further road infrastructure to accommodate the needs of such an increased housing development
357	5	Finally should we not be looking at developing brown field sites before entering into this project?
358	1	No, the type of housing proposed and the consultation evening would be aimed at the higher end of the market spectrum swinging the balance towards a commuter type village. Cuckney currently has a varied cross section of both age and class.
358	2	An even balance of both affordable houses and houses that reflect the character of Cuckney in style and materials.
358	3	A maximum of 5 houses should be built
358	4	Area 399 offers east of access, free draining and without risk of flooding that both 303 and 398 do not offer. New comment: Plot 399 is also located in an area of the village which has been developed n recent times without major impact visually
358	5	Its worth considering that Cuckney is served by an ancient private water supply by Welbeck Estates Co Ltd. Over the years Welbeck have opposed proposed building projects on the basis that their water supply would not support further development in Cuckney and that the aforementioned system has not been improved which could effect supply to existing residents
359	1	Having read and studied the proposals that have been put forward for the Local Development Framework, we feel very strongly that sites 37 and 512 often Lane in Retford are not suitable for the development of housing for the following reasons:
359	2	There would appear to be a significant lack of infrastructure in services, highways and schools within this area to support the proposed level of increased occupation.
359	3	There are also serious concerns with regards to the safe access and exit of vehicles onto Tiln Lane and the amount of heavy goods vehicles which use this route which is close to Carr Hill Primary School. There is also a blind bend from Tiln Lane onto Smeath Lane which has been known for many years by local residents and County Councillors who have campaigned to reduce the amount of traffic using this already busy route
359	4	Historically this land has always been used for agricultural purposes and is indeed a Greenfield site which the land adjacent mirrors. A large building development in this locality would detract from the existing green infrastructure
359	5	The land both on and adjacent to these proposed sites already has poor drainage and is liable to flooding.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
359	6	Bolham Lane which runs alongside site 37 is used by local school children and residents as a pedestrian route through to Hallcroft and the Elizabethan School and is not suitable for increased traffic. The lane suffers from severe subsidence due to the close proximity of the River Idle and flood plain. There has also been severe run off of water onto Bolham Lane from the fields where the buildings are proposed and if this site was developed this would only increase due to the reduced intake of water into the land due to hard landscaping.
359	7	The main sewage pipe from Hayton and Claborough runs through the proposed site and onto the Bolham Lane pumping station which over the years has caused profound problems to the local residents and seven Trent. A major development on these sites would only serve to increase the demand on this system which would at present be unlikely to cope.
359	8	A mains water pipe also runs along Bolham Lane and up into the field and along the boundary of site 37 which already causes major problems to the local water pressure due to the old cast iron supply (Anglian waters can confirm this).
359	9	A wildlife corridor runs through Retford along the River Idle and site 37 and continues through to the SSI Idle Valley Nature Reserve. Indeed both proposed sites are regular hunting grounds for the Barn Owls, Tawny Owls and Buzzards which can be seen regularly flying around. These sites are also a haven to many other wildlife such as weasels, pheasants, butterflies, hedgehogs, bats to name but a few.
359	10	We strongly urge the planning department to look closely at any proposed development on these two Greenfield sites which could impact heavily on the character of the local area and its community
360	1	Option A
360	2	We think the housing allocation for Ranskill should be OAP bungalows and 2 bed houses A1 or starter for the young in the village. We have ample 3, 4 and 5 bed homes.
360	3	Sites 156-157 have enough space for 14 houses are in the confines of the village.
360	4	I think Ranskill has room for expansion it has a good school, park and shop.
360	5	REMOVED
360	6	We own plot 157 approx 6 acres with brilliant access put in by the railway, also 3 phase electric is run down to the property but not connected. It is an ideal site for industrial or a small housing estate
361	1	It is considered that over the next 18 years there will be a demand for further housing in the village of Beckingham. Housing development is of course only as good as it's location, we believe that the Moat House site is well situated for this purpose. Consideration of the Heritage site has been given when preparing this document
361	2	The site is within the village settlement on the edge of the village. The existing shared drive currently serves three dwellings and therefore the impact of any housing development would be subtle and be seen as a natural extension and part of the village scene. The drive itself could be easily extended to serve further development.
361	3	We consider that the site would be capable of taking up to 18 dwellings, a mixture of all important sustainable housing. A number of semi detached and detached. These dwellings could be provided over a period of time as required
361	4	The site can be accessed by an existing drive off Gringley Road
361	5	Mains Water is provided on site and access to the Main Sewer is close to hand
361	6	The site is located in a pleasant rural environment adjacent to existing housing
361	7	Should the site be developed minimal disturbance and impact to the environment would take place. There are no trees or bushes on the site. Existing outbuildings could be demolished and removed as required
361	8	We would respectfully suggest that if Beckingham Village wishes to retain its existing amenities and secure further sort after amenities like 'Play Areas', without growth this may be difficult to achieve. We foresee greater competition between village settlements to secure schools, shops, public houses, etc. Those settlements that cannot currently sustain such amenities shall need growth in order to do so. We believe the Moat House site is an ideal candidate in order to provide such growth. We are pleased to submit the above reasons, which we believe to be valid and worthy reasons for the Councils consideration. Should you require any further information in relation to our proposed site please let us know.
361	9	It is considered that over the next 18 years there will be a demand for further housing in the village of Beckingham. Housing development is of course only as good as it's siting, we believe that the Beecher Lane site is well situated for this purpose

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
361	10	The site is on the edge of the village settlement and therefore the impact of any housing development would be subtle and be seen as a natural extension and part of the existing village itself
361	11	We consider that the site would be capable of taking up to 18 dwellings, a mixture of all important sustainable housing. A number of semi detached and detached dwellings. These dwellings could be provided over a period of time as required.
361	12	The site can be accessed by an existing access via. Beecher Lane or by an existing access via the A 161.
361	13	Mains Water is provided on site and access to the Main Sewer is close to hand.
361	14	The site is located in a pleasant rural environment adjacent to existing housing ego There is an existing bungalow on Beecher Lane and housing opposite the entrance to Beecher Lane.
361	15	Should the site be developed, minimal disturbance and impact to the environment
361	16	We would respectfully suggest that if Beckingham Village wishes to retain its existing amenities and secure further sort after amenities like 'Play Areas', without growth this may be difficult to achieve. We foresee greater competition between village settlements to secure schools, shops, public houses, etc. Those settlements that cannot currently sustain such amenities shall need growth in order to do so. We believe the Moat House site is an ideal candidate in order to provide such growth. We are pleased to submit the above reasons, which we believe to be valid and worthy reasons for the Councils consideration. Should you require any further information in relation to our proposed site please let us know.
362	1	Option A
362	2	Yes, again 20 new houses would be maximum for the village. Sewers , drains, sewerage, electric etc. are now nearing their capacity
362	3	Sites 228 and 229 was previously shown by map
362	4	Thankfully, Rampton Parish Council have reviewed site 230 and voted to withdraw it from the Planning Department Framework
362	5	The 10 acres which is to play area and sports field should be shown as a protected site.
362	6	38/1 should be developed as an orchard, meadow with wild flowers.
363	1	Yes
363	2	Please see Parish Plan
363	3	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
363	4	4 New houses would be acceptable providing they are on Brown field sites and in accordance with the Parish Plan
363	5	Any new development should be on 281
363	6	We feel you should be aware of the fact that the Low Road to Lound form the Gate Inn to Bellmore Lane is far too narrow to carry the traffic already using it. Two large vehicles cannot pass on the corner round the site numbered 274, one has to reverse or mount the pavement which Lound Children use on their way to and from School.
363	7	The open spaces identified on the map should be protected and developed as specified in the parish plan
363	8	We feel the existing site is perfectly adequate
363	9	This could be part of the Gypsy site as it never appears to be full.
364	1	We are writing to put our objections and serious concerns across regarding the proposed planned housing development of 230 houses north of badgers chase, Durham grove and park lane in the north of Retford . n addition to this is the proposed new development for a travellers site and industries and the land at the top of Bigsby Road
364	2	We have received no consultation regarding this new proposed development that would drastically alter the lovely open character of the area that as attracted many families to move and reside there over the years.
364	3	Currently the roads are only just sufficient enough to carry the volume of traffic that passes through especially on Tiln Lane when the schools are open. The roads would not be sufficient to take the increased volume of traffic that would be generated by this new development and this would on the safety of pedestrians ' and children along this area.
364	4	As parents ourselves we are very concerned of the impact on e current primary school and the ~ safety of our son near proposed busy areas, not to mention the potential over crowding of the school which could impact on our child's education
364	5	Many resident of the area live there because of the open land that they look out on or can access within minutes by foot. This development would ruin the landscape and outlook of good agricultural land and countryside

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
365	1	The proposed house building sites in this area numbered 3 , 370 and 511 are all low-lying) and flood every year after periods of heavy precipitation or the melt of snow in February and March. The land is heavy clay and the water table is high.
365	2	We have seen field 370 completely flooded like a lake with water pouring down the Grove hillside looking like a weir. Houses at the end of Grove Coach Road, St Stephen's Road and St Helen's Road have all suffered flooding
365	3	When this water has eventually drained away towards Retford, then Grove Lane, Blackstope Lane and Trent Street have had massive problems with house flooding, when residents have been evacuated for up to a year
365	4	The Government and House Insurers have advised against building on land prone to flooding, looking to the future when the sea level is predicted to rise.
365	5	Any such development on these 3 sites would certainly flood, endangering the existing housing estate by increasing pressure on the already failing drainage system and consequently creating more problems in Retford
365	6	A Council that plans for such a development must also prepare for the aftermath of '0 flooding and the huge financial toll that it entails. Building on these sites is surely not viable
365	7	therefore urge the Council to seek alternative building sites, and a plan which will fulfil I Retford's needs and prove to be an asset over the next 20 years .
366	1	Suggested sites for a low number (approx 10) new houses in Ranskill would be the following
366	2	Brown field large area, easy access, no loss privacy
366	3	Large area no traffic congestion, easy access, no loss privacy.
366	4	Large area, longer access required, some loss privacy
366	5	Strip of land East edge only along Folly Nook Lane. Smaller area, easy access, no loss privacy
366	6	East edge only. Building along the Great North Road. Easy access. 30 mph zone already exists. But possibly will increase flooding east side of Great North Rd
366	7	With regard to 157, 156, 234 East, it would be important to avoid extra traffic
367	1	I wish to lodge my objection to this proposed development. Apart from the fact that that the whole character of the area will be vastly changed, is this not agricultural land?
367	2	brownfield sites should not be developed first
367	3	and for that matter how about the many houses in Retford that stand Should they not be occupied before yet more houses are built and left to stand unoccupied?
367	4	The proposed development would also add greatly to the heavy traffic which now uses Tiln lane and thus exacerbate the present congestion and danger.
368	1	Yes
368	2	228
368	3	Yes, open space site should be protected.
369	1	On behalf of myself, my husband and our grown children, I write to strongly object to the above. Site reference numbers 370 and 511 as identified in the Bassetlaw District Local Development Framework, Site Allocations, Issues and Options document. We believe these sites are not suitable for future housing development.
369	2	Traffic leaving Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road experience difficulty at the present time. Any increase of traffic assessing a new housing estate would cause even greater problems.
369	3	Our local school, bracken Lane Primary, is at present oversubscribed and would not be able to take in any more children from a new housing development.
369	4	Unfortunately during the floods of recent years, many properties were flooded from water draining from the adjacent hills. Any new development would obviously experience the same problems.
369	5	We are aware of other sites in Retford which would be more suitable for the kind of proposed developments, and question why these sites have not been chosen.
369	6	As owners of our property, which is adjacent to the proposed development we wish to strongly object.
370	1	It has come to our attention of a proposed housing development, 231 houses north of Badgers Chase and 915 houses on land north of Durham Grove, Palmer Road, Bigsby Road and Park Lane Retford. We have obtained a copy of the of Bassetlaw's Site Allocation and Options Consultation Paper and it is astounding the amount of housing that is being proposed. This letter is to object to the proposals. We are very disappointed that there has been no consultation with residents prior to production of the proposal.
370	2	These developments will alter the character of the area & the poor road infrastructure is most unsuitable for such a development, additional traffic congestion and a danger to road users and pedestrians on Tiln Lane area would be a huge danger to life, Highway Safety should be a major consideration for objecting to these proposals

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
370	3	At present vast amounts of traffic using Carr Hill School do not always go out onto the junction from Tiln Lane to Moorgate but use the smaller Roads from School and come down Park Lane, some at great speed, before reaching the junction onto Welham Road and then continuing their journey back through town down Moorgate, to increase this area of Retford with 1146 more houses and with a possibility of 2 cars to each household is a danger, this could generate over 2000 more cars to add to this already over congested area.
370	4	Personally we feel very strongly about objecting to this proposal of development and our own property could lose its loss of privacy and could be overshadowed by buildings near to our house & back garden with the possibility of loss of light.
370	5	These proposed areas have many trees and to lose them would be damaging to our environment as well as the ecological factor which could result in a loss of many birds and animals that live in these areas.
370	6	Additionally these proposed areas involve building outside the existing development envelope and also involves building outside the borough boundary, all brownfield sites should be developed for housing before developing the edge of town and beyond the borough boundary.
371	1	Yes, 9 houses seems an adequate response given the existing village infrastructure
371	2	Site 178 opposite Blyth Hall
371	3	The most serious issue in my opinion is the lack of Public Car Parking in the Village
371	4	Site 266 should be developed as additional 'open space' to add to the limited open spaces areas already in the village.
372	1	I consider the proposals for the two villages to be excessive in numbers and locations. If the total complement of housing was to be built on all of these sites then the population of the villages would increase by at least 40% and possibly by as much as 100% ie double The number of houses suggested for sites 170 and 258 alone could almost double the population. Not only would this completely change the nature of the villages by destroying their rural nature but would be impractical for the following reasons:
372	2	Clarborough Primary School. The school is currently full, additional housing and families could lead to serious overcrowding. As I understand the situation, some children are already being taught in a corridor. In addition there is currently a serious problem with parking in the vicinity of the school, especially at the beginning and end of the school day, but also when events take place at the school. This is not only causing aggravation and great inconvenience for the residents of Hil1view Crescent but creating serious safety issues onto the A620. Any further numbers in the school will only make this worse.
372	3	Secondary School Provision. All 11 + pupils <i>have</i> to travel into Retford or Gainsborough. An increase in the school population would create more road journeys and increase the number of pupils at the secondary schools who find it difficult to access after school activities. This is due to the poor public transport to the villages. They are, therefore, disadvantaged in this respect.
372	4	Further Education. Those pupils choosing to extend their education at Retford Sixth Form College would have the same disadvantages as the younger pupils at secondary schools in Retford. Those choosing North Notts College in Worksop would have the additional problem of needing 2 bus journeys each way and this would exacerbate the problems of both day time access and access of after hours provision.
372	5	Water Supply. There is already some concern on St John's Drive, Clarborough, about the quality and stability of the water supply. Increases in population would only make this problem worse.
372	6	Sewage. Poor sewage facilities in Clarborough, especially on the western side of Main Street, i.e. in the area where the largest concentration of housing is suggested, are a long term problem in the village. This has led to raw sewage being released onto land on the western edges of the village.
372	7	Broadband. The villages are a long way from the telephone exchange in Retford. This creates problems with internet usage, making much online provision unavailable in the villages as speeds and bandwidth are too low for meaningful internet access. eg Accessing BBC iPlayer is likely to give either a programme which stops <i>every</i> few seconds to load the next section or a message saying there is not enough bandwidth to load anything at all! In the digital age, with so many commercial and governmental organisations urging greater use of the internet, this should be seen as a serious concern.
372	8	Employment. There is no provision for Jobs in the village. Indeed, in recent months several jobs have been lost due to the closure of the shop / Post Office, the Kings Arms public house, both in Clarborough, and The Boat public house in Hayton. If the outline planning permission for Corner House Farm (Site Reference 171) is followed through then even more jobs are likely to be lost All new residents would have to travel out of the village for work and, thus, create more traffic for local roads.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
372	9	Public Transport. Public transport is very limited, with no provision in the late afternoon and evening or on Sunday. The bus timetable is as follows: Buses into Retford are Monday to Friday, hourly service between 07.24h and 14.28h. Saturday - as above plus one extra bus at 16.58h. Sunday - no service. Buses from Retford are: Monday to Friday - hourly service between 09.30h and 14.30h then 15.55h and 17.50h. Saturday - as above. Sunday - no service. The timing of the buses means that anyone wishing to make even a short visit to Retford and carry out business there (eg a visit to the post office) faces a 2 -3hr round trip. For any resident without their own transport, including teenagers, there is no opportunity to access any event in Retford In the late afternoon and evening or to return later than the last bus at 17.50 pm. The use of personal cars will again increase traffic flow into, through and out of the village.
372	10	Facilities. There are few facilities in the villages. There IS no shop, post office, library or medical facility in the villages. There are only very limited leisure facilities in the form of two village play areas. Accessing these types of facilities already generates car traffic into Retford and other towns. Extra population would increase traffic through the villages and on the roads into Retford.
372	11	Traffic. The main road through the village is the A620, which runs between Retford and Gainsborough and includes a very low railway bridge between Welham and Clarborough. Whilst this road is designated 40 mph, traffic frequently travels above this speed, especially commercial traffic. Almost all vehicles travelling from Retford into the village 30 mph limit continue to travel at or above 36 mph. This is shown by the traffic speed warning signs on entry to the village. Many vehicles do not slow below this speed all the way through the village. Traffic travelling through the village towards Retford is frequently travelling above the 30 mph limit by the time it is passing the end of Howbeck Lane, Big Lane and Church Lane. The dangers of Welham corner are well known as HGV drivers continue to ignore warning signs for the low bridge between Clarborough and Hayton. Increased traffic on this road will only enhance the dangers currently associated with and caused by this bridge. Large numbers of extra housing in the village would cause increased traffic flow along the A620 and problems into and out of Retford which will increase the dangers of road transport.
372	12	A620 "by-pass" - due to the low railway bridge on the A620, Tiln Lane (Retford) · Smeath Lane (Clarborough) is the only route which allows high sided HGV's up to 40t to travel from Retford to Gainsborough as it avoids this bridge. This is not a by-pass but a narrow, unclassified, country lane! A large number of HGVs travel the road in each direction every day Only in part of the Tiln Lane section is the road wide enough to allow two HGVs to pass and this only with care. Much of Smeath Lane does not allow passing and vehicles have to use the roadside verges. Over the years this has resulted in a number of these vehicles overturning into ditches. It is, therefore, a dangerous road. As vehicles enter the village from Retford along Smeath Lane they have to cross a 'humped back' canal bridge. Many do this at some speed despite the one way nature which their size imposes on the bridge. If a similar sized vehicle is travelling in the opposite direction these HGVs frequently mount the pavement to negotiate the narrow road, with consequent dangers to pedestrians using the pavement. This occurs frequently. After crossing the bridge the HGVs immediately come into residential housing where cars are turning in order to enter Broad Gores or private drives. This creates dangers for those vehicles which are turning. In order to return to the A620 at the bottom of Clarborough Hill the HGVs have to take a right turn and then immediately turn left. The size of these vehicles frequently means they block the exit of Smeath Lane, are diagonally across Main Street, Hayton, and block the exit from Clarborough Main Street They then have to pull out onto the A620. When travelling from Gainsborough to Retford the HGVs have to negotiate a completely blind corner at the bottom of Clarborough Hill in order to turn right to gain access to Smeath Lane. This has enormous safety implications for traffic travelling through the village towards either Gainsborough or Clayworth or in the reverse directions.
372	13	Putting nearly 100 houses onto Site References 170 and 258, In addition to the 32 on Site 171, would create much more traffic movement at the junction between Smeath Lane / Main Street Hayton and Clarborough Hill and, consequently, greatly increase the potential for road traffic accidents. This number of extra houses would also cause much more, and more dangerous, traffic movements at the junction of Smeath Lane and Broad Gores.
372	14	The suggestions for Site Reference 170 and 258 would connect the two ends of Broad Gores. This would produce a through road which changes the nature of the current cul-de-sacs. The most common description for this new road I have heard used by those commenting on these plans is "it will become a rat run. Both Big Lane and both ends of Broad Gores are very narrow roads which are unsuitable for increased traffic flows. In addition any contractor traffic during a construction phase would make the roads extremely dangerous if not Impossible to negotiate. The egress from Big Lane onto the A620 can already be hazardous, especially at peak times. With extra traffic generated through the village this would become even more so. Even when traffic obeys the 30 mph speed limit, and most does not, turning light out of Big Lane towards Retford, especially, is already a dangerous procedure due to the short sight lines along the A620 towards the village centre.
372	15	In times of snow local roads are not gritted by either Nottinghamshire County or Bassetlaw District Councils. In December 2010 this left Big Lane in a dangerous condition for about 4 weeks, with many near misses as vehicles, even where driven carefully, negotiated snow, ice and deep ruts. Increased traffic flow would make accidents inevitable.
372	16	All roads within the village are narrow, including the Big Lane estate, Smeath Lane estate, Howbeck Lane and Church Lane. This limits the safe movement of traffic within the village. Increased traffic numbers would increase danger to both adults and children.
372	17	Flooding. The land concerned is liable to flooding during heavy rainfall and little has been done to alleviate this since the most recent floods which affected a number of areas in the village.
372	18	Alternatives. The most obvious alternative is to site houses where facilities exist – i.e. larger centres of population. This reduces the need for car transport, there being much better public transport in these centres. In-fill building could be acceptable in specific cases in the Clarborough-Hayton area. Single/double sites would not put the pressure on the road network and other facilities which large scale building would produce. The sites for this infill in the villages are limited and this would naturally limit the increase in population. This type of building, by its very limited nature, would not affect the character or rural nature of the villages.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
372	19	Option A -spread between the towns of Retford , Worksop and Harworth Bircotes. These towns have 'brownfield' sites which should be the first target for further development of any sort, including housing. There are repeated demands from developers for 'greenfield' sites when there are derelict 'brownfield' sites which are being ignored. This increasingly occupies farming, recreational and greenbelt land. In addition, towns have the facilities on hand which rural villages such as Clarborough-Hayton do not.
372	20	Not necessarily. Any new housing in these villages should be confined to infill. This type of land usually utilises land which is neglected and unsightly. It makes no fundamental change to the shape or character of either individual roads or to the whole of the villages.
372	21	Corner farm is an acceptable development as it would improve the appearance of the village without increasing land usage in the village. The suggested numbers are, however, excessive and the style needs to be carefully controlled to ensure the development does not dominate this prominent area of the two villages. Problems with vehicle access and egress at this site need to be carefully considered as it lies at the Clarborough Main Street - Smeath Lane junction, which already has serious traffic issues.
372	22	No large scale single sites should be used throughout the villages. No high density housing should be included, even at Corner Farm. Any developments of this type would fundamentally alter the character of the villages.
372	23	There must only be development within the villages of Clarb/Hayton which can be sustained by the existing, very, very limited facilities. Frequently there are suggestions that increased housing would bring an increase in facilities. In these villages this has not been the case. Over time, facilities have decreased and continue to do so despite a slow increase in the numbers of houses. This has especially been the case in recent years with two public houses and the only shop/post office closing within the last 12 months. This is despite the building of a number of houses in the villages.
372	24	A good example of the lack of investment is that of the proposed by-pass for Clarborough to end the use of Tiln Lane/Smeath Lane, by HGVs. The proposal has existed for over 35 years with various reincarnations being suggested from a full by-pass to one which simply avoids the low bridge . The latter so called by-pass (suggested for building in 2006) would, in reality, direct all 40T high sided HGVs through the centre of the village, thus making the situation in the village dramatically worse than that which currently occurs. The inherent dangers for residents would be magnified many times!
373	1	We moved to Retford in 1971 buying a new home on the Richmond Development. Retford Road, Haddon Road and Cavendish Road. We were advised by the agents and the, then, Retford Borough Council that the land in that area was designated flood area but Richmond Development had to be the last in that area- Richmond installed poor land drains and moved away from soak ways wherever possible and by and large there are not been many serious wash backs or flood damage- not so in Durham Grove, Blackstope Lane area.
373	2	The drainage dyke system is at full capacity and could not take anymore. We were told we were safe from any further development adjacent to ours, as the cost of making the land drain system safe and efficient would be so particular, no developer would take it on. In the event a company named Almawake Ltd (mostly the participants were local councillors) roughly the paddock south and the south side of Haddon Road and applied on a number of occasion for planning permission to build residential perpetuity – all applications were refused on the grounds that the land/drainage was unsuitable until a final application which went to a formal appeal hearing before a D of E chairman, and a banister expanded, was after some deliberation, approved. The features which swung the decision was that the developer would install sewerage drainage pipes emptying to the beck through special self opening/closing water pressure valves an this the sewage pipes, with the valve closed, would get as serious to contain the water until the level in the Beck had outsider and then the meter would be released. It was made clear that no further development could take place in this area as the beck was now effectively taking now then its general capacity in villages). The problem now lies at the other side of the Beck and up to Grove Hills were drainage eventually seeps down to the Beck through “sponge land” - Dawson fields etc. – if roofing is erected on that land the drains will be uncontrollably increased an the Beck would be very quietly overcome and all that are found often flooding.
373	3	Access Road to the area could only be Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road which are at present overloaded at certain times (school traffic) and houses at the London Road end of Grove Coach Road do not have garages and there is considerable on road parking which adds obstruction to the problem – for more traffic to use those roads would lead to an impossible situation.
373	4	Bracken Lane school which serves the area does not have any capacity for additional pupils and its playing field offers its own drainage problems
373	5	From information available at present it would appear that any development would be out of keeping with the area – and with great respect Retford ahs many house available for sale at present and the town does not need any increase in size of population – and what development that could in the medium term would be served by until on existing sites) the old Grammar School, Ordsall Hall etc.).
374	1	We are unaware of the screening methodology so we cannot comment on this.
374	2	Option A
374	3	Agreed
374	4	Sites 224 and 234
374	5	No
374	6	Some of the sites should remain protected e.g. 157 and 537
374	7	REMOVED
374	8	REMOVED
374	9	No land known for travellers
375	1	Option A

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
375	2	No, build on plots 534 and 577
375	3	Plots 412 and 413 should not be developed by building houses as it will spoil the view of those living in the row of small cottages and cause potential dangers on the A638 with more vehicle access
375	4	Develop sites 534 and 577
375	5	As we never received a copy of the original questionnaire, I cannot comment.
375	6	Yes
375	7	Yes, affordable housing, a community hall/room and a play area equipped for children up to the age of 11, including soft play area for toddlers.
375	8	I can see no suitable site within Gamston at present.
376	1	I am very concerned about the impact the proposed development could have on the villages of Claborough Hayton
376	2	The high density of housing on the site will mean a significant increase in vehicular traffic at an already dangerous junction, in addition, the traffic will increase on the 'rat run' down Smeath Lane (an unclassified by-road) by those avoiding the speed restrictions on the main road through Welham
376	3	Pedestrians and bicycles are already at risk as speed limits and consideration for other road users are ignored, crossing the canal bridge being high risk procedure.
376	4	I would suggest a risk assessment would highlight a potential safety issue, careful consideration, at this stage, is far better than having to use accident statistics and hindsight to prove a point.
377	1	The character of the whole area will be altered.
377	2	The roads in their present state would be quite inadequate. The traffic congestion on Tiln Lane, which takes very heavy lorries to and from the east to avoid the low bridge at Welham, will be an added danger to roads is proposed? Presumably widening of the roads, and access to the new sites would involve loss of agricultural land and the felling of such trees which are in the way.
377	3	I note also that the development on greenfield sites, with the loss of further farming land and it is to be changed we never have to be land - it is shaped we never have to totally dependent on producing our vegetables, cereal crops, quarrying for our animals etc.
377	4	In new of the above comment, I strongly object to the proposal which involved building outside the borough boundary
377	5	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford.
377	6	The existing Highway Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic.
377	7	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
377	8	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road users and school children. HGV's have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
377	8	Apart from the general concerns expressed above, this is going to put an estimated 1,000 extra cars onto Tiln Lane where traffic levels including large numbers of heavy good vehicles are already a cause for concern. I expect gridlock at busy times of day, especially at the Tiln Lane/Moorgate junction.
377	9	It is surprising that proposals of this magnitude have not been given wider publicity. Many more people are likely to be directly affected have no inkling of what the Council propose.
377	10	Where are these extra people going to be employed
377	11	In the area of Tiln Lane specifically, the proposals envisage: up to 716 houses in the fields at the end of Bigsby Road, with access via Tiln Lane, up to 183 houses in the fields existing onto Longholme Road and up to 247 houses with access onto Tiln Lane. This represents about 30% of the total development proposed near Retford.
378	1	I write to object in the strongest terms to the proposed future development of the potential housing sites adjacent to Bracken Lane, Grove Coach Road and Cavendish Road. The site reference numbers are 370 and 511 as identified in the Bassetlaw District Local Development Framework, Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation Document.
378	2	The hazardous access to London Road from Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane is already very difficult with the current volume of traffic. Additional housing and the consequential increase in the traffic seeking to enter London Road to access Retford via Grove Lane. These are all single vehicle width and hence unsuitable for the increased amount of traffic
378	3	These roads are also used by children walking to and from Bracken Lane School. Any increase in traffic would pose a greater danger to these children.
378	4	During the recent floods of 2007 a number of properties in the area were flooded by surface water draining from the adjacent hills. At that time the situation was largely contained as sites 370 and 511 reduced the risk to adjacent properties by acting as a buffer zone, allowing water to collect in the fields before slowly draining away. Any developments of these two sites would replace the slow draining fields with a significant amount of hard surface which would increase the amount of surface run off both in speed and quantity thereby placing adjacent properties at a greater risk of flooding. Any rising of the sites to protect the new properties would also greatly increase the risk to existing properties adjacent to the site
378	5	The proposed sites are situated at the very edge of Retford and are therefore at some distance from local amenities. From the proposed development it is one mile to the nearest convenience store and someone and half a mile to the main shopping and commercial area in the town centre. The proposal to build housing so far from shops and other amenities will lead to a dangerous increase of pedestrian and motor traffic on narrow local roads.
378	6	The local school for the area, Bracken Lane Primary School is currently oversubscribed and would not be able to accommodate the large influx of additional children which the proposed development would generate.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
378	7	Existing properties in the area adjacent to the proposed sites are all detached properties with ample parking. The housing density per acre is far less than 30 dwellings per acre proposed which would make the new development totally out of keeping with its surrounding.
378	8	The proposed sites are surrounded by hedgerows which are home to many species of birds, animals and insects. Any future development of the sites would put at risk the biodiversity of the area.
379	1	Why is the expansion of the town for housing seen as necessary on large areas around the periphery when such a small area proportionally dedicated for employment?
379	2	Why is it acceptable to allocate areas of farmland and flood land for future development yet not allow a small area, within the existing building framework to be deemed as not developable.
380	1	After much searching and viewing we found Sunnymede on Smeath Lane, it was ideal with a small orchard being a bungalow that we could easily maintain, the road was quiet with just a small degree of traffic. I decided to make an offer on the property, but before I did this I employed a company to give me a road count of traffic on Smeath Lane where the property is situated. To my pleasure the county was as expected with around 200 vehicles over a period of 24 hours and around 30 vehicles over the same period, with on busy days cars numbering just has many, most using the road as a rat run, or short cut to Retford or the other way to Gainsborough. Smeath Lane is situated in a position of being in a basin, one side has terraced type houses, the other side which is on the Hayton boundary rises to display bungalows and houses which are in private ownership, the context of this configuration is that it acts as an audible trap of noise, the sound from passing traffic and the many HGV lorries escape, it creates a resonance of noise which bounces back and forth from the opposing properties which impedes everyone 24 hours a day, seven days a week.
380	2	The coke haulage companies serving West Burton Power Station continually flout planning consents and pass fully loaded through the village and over the small hump back bridge adjacent to the Gate Inn. The size and length of the vehicles means they have to come over the small Victorian hum back bridge right in the centre, and it is quite often that another HGV or car is coming the other way. On Tiln Lane the circumstances are even more dangerous, cars regularly pass this winding road doing over 80 mile an hour, coke lorries and other HGVs have been recorded by me doing in excess of 60 mile an hour fully loaded. The Tiln Road configuration is so that it is IMPOSSIBLE for a HGV to pass many parts of the roads without coming a third over the white line, in their urgency to get more deliveries of coke, or other goods they are delivering – they still approach these dangerous bends at great speed, leaving no chance of stopping if they had to, and this is true of the rat run vehicles who attain speeds which are not only against the law, but will without nay shadow of a doubt be a cause of a major accident in the very near future.
380	3	Then there is Carr Hill School, parents park along both sides of the roadside to pick up or drop off their children, large HGV vehicle have to pass this school only squeezing past cars by inches, while young children are let out of the school gates, or cross the road to get into the school –again this scenario is a regular occurrence, and some of the lollipop ladies holding their hand signs are miniature against the giant radiator fronts of these massive HGVs. The road is used so much that when the lollipop ladies stop the traffic, a queue builds up both ways very quickly involving cars and HGVs, a child of five or six years old stood against one of the wheels of these huge HGVs is a sight to make one cringe, I cannot imagine what would happen if one of these vehicles went out of control into the crowds of small children and mothers – it is an accident waiting to happen – HGVs and schools DO NOT MIX.
380	4	The Planning Department in their wisdom have once again pushed to one side the implications of the infrastructure of Smeath Lane – Tiln Road in their urge to complete planning consents for more houses, flats, bungalows – in an area that urgently needs help at this time for redirecting traffic, slowing down traffic, also imposing a 7.5 ton limit, and to create pinch slowing points to slow the speeding rat run cars, and the HGVs using Smeath Lane or Tiln Lane. Vehicle approaching from Hayton rather than take the short cut road along Smeath Lane and Tiln Lane, rather than the long route under the low bridge at Welham, it is a fact that 90% of traffic generated from Hayton Village goes this way creating more traffic, which adds to the already over and abused roadway system of Smeath Lane and Tiln Lane.
380	5	More residential houses would be a burden on this out-dated and dangerous road way system, it would create more pressure on the already dangerous environment of the road design, without a delay any residential of the proposed Corner Farm location – if it was allowed to go ahead, would use the short cut route on Smeath Lane - Tiln Lane this adding more to the problem all resident are now experiencing.
380	6	To allow other buildings areas in Hayton Clarborough without first addressing this traffic problems in essence lunacy, the area needs a bypass urgently, the area needs help instead of more traffic pollution and speeding rat run cars, the area need a planning committee that is forward looking in its views, instead of creating more and more problems for existing residents. In 2004 my wife was hit on Tiln Lane by a HGV vehicle, it came around one of the tight corner fully loaded at great speed across the wrong side of the road, in essence the HGV vehicles had not choice than to go on the opposite road side, because an HGV cannot get around these beds in the road without crossing the middle road lines – its IMPOSSIBLE!
380	7	We have no police officer present on the road checking speeds, we have no help from any department, be it Planning, Highways, or enforcement of planning consents of the continued coke traffic HGV using the road feeding West Burton Power Station.
380	8	I object to the proposed planning scheme by BDC to allocate land for building of more houses in the Clarborough Hayton area on the grounds that the infrastructure if roads and bridges are already stretched to breaking point, by the ever increasing traffic.
380	9	Furthermore my property as other owners on Smeath Lane have lost considerable value, we all find it difficult to sell nay property, no one wishes to live in an area where great noise of crashing HGV vehicles occur 24 hours a day, no one wants to live where stream so fears continue on the road at great speeds in urgency to cut their time of their journey. Any person with a young family would not want to live adjacent to a road that is classified as a B road, and used more an A road, in fear if their children’s safety.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
380	10	John Mann has tried many times to get these problems sorted for the residents of Smeath Lane, and Tiln Lane, only to be confronted by the proposal on planning to convert the old Victorian bridge adjacent to the Gate Inn into a higher carrying weight – these foolish plans would in essence create more problems for residents rather than curtail them - the planning committee must look at these problems right now, all plans of building more residential homes must be shelved until this dangerous, and unbearable traffic problem is stopped.
381	1	I agree to 12 new houses on Brown sites only. Any more will create more traffic pollution and danger
381	2	I would object on grounds of road infrastructure
381	3	None. Until a new bypass is completed or a 7.5 ton limit placed on Tiln Lane – Smeath Lane and pinch road areas to slow traffic.
381	4	Children in danger on road at Carr Hill School due to traffic passing to and from Smeath Lane area as a rat run
381	5	Also the biodiversity of the area with many rare species and invertebrates
382	1	Whilst we support the principle of utilising site assessment criteria to assess the suitability of respective sites for development as the right and proper course of action.
382	2	It is the interpretation of the ‘scoring system’ and its outcomes that is critical to deciding which site should come forward. The setting up of a green, amber and red system for each criteria should be seen as a guide and not as an absolute method of determining which sites should come for development, as a totting up approach of scoring greens ambers and reds is too simplistic and potentially flawed. Paragraph 2.17 of the supporting text states that it is not the Council’s intention to rank the sites, yet the remainder of the paragraph and the following paragraph 2.18 conversely suggest however, that ranking of sites is generally what the Council is intending to do. There are a number of issues that need to be considered in the interpretation of the ‘scoring system’ and which mitigate against applying a simple scoring system. I set out examples below: -
382	3	(i) Weighting - Should all nine criteria be given considered equal weight or are some criteria more fundamental to the site selection? I would suggest for example that criteria 2 is more important than criteria 4, particularly as the Council are not generally looking at many ‘strategic’ scale sites of over 20 ha which is the threshold at which Defrag is to be consulted on the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.
382	4	(ii) The consideration of Constraints – The larger the site, and / or the more complex the site in terms of its capacity for mixed use, the greater the prospect of development constraints being identified. Clearly if significant constraints cannot be overcome than in many cases the site should not be developed yet there will inevitably be large and/or mixed use sites which have some constraints, albeit capable of resolution, that will result in a site delivering major sustainability benefits being marked down to an amber rating, whilst other smaller greenfield site which deliver limited community benefit will secure a higher green rating.
382	5	(iii) Criterion 5 - Impacts on Water Source Protection Zones - potentially generates a conflict in that sites in the major (sustainable) settlements may well be scored amber or red , whilst sites in less sustainable locations may score green by virtue of not falling within an SPZ. Given that housing is not considered as a polluting activity, we would question the merit of including this criterion for housing assessments as it has the potential to downgrade sites unnecessarily on the basis of location within a graduated SPZ whilst having negligible impact thereon.
382	6	In our opinion, there should be an additional ‘local infrastructure’ category which assesses sites in respect of their ability to support existing community facilities and infrastructure /or deliver enhanced facilities as part of the site allocation. Criterion 3 is the only criteria which positively scores sites for delivering economic development yet there are wider considerations that should be taken into account when the suitability of a site is being assessed. For example, the ability of a site to support local facilities should be recognised, as should sites which can deliver facilities for which the local community has identified a specific need. For example the opportunity for a major site to deliver a primary school site or a smaller rural service to deliver a local play area or school playing field extension are tangible and significant benefits that individual sites can deliver, yet falls outside the current range of assessment criteria. Our request to the Council is to be pragmatic and look at critically at all the benefits that a site has to offer and not to be too focused on the scoring system of the traffic light system in the light of the comments made.
382	7	We do not support either Option A or B.
382	8	We have expressed the view in responding to the Core Strategy that we consider that the scale of housing promoted for Harworth- Bircotes for the plan period to 2028 is not deliverable having particular regard to the marketability of the settlement and long term historically low housing completion rates. The regeneration agenda for the town is acknowledged yet the housing delivery expectations are wholly unrealistic.
382	9	Any additional future housing growth should be focused at those settlements that are well served with a greater number of services and facilities and therefore more sustainable settlements.
382	10	Strongly disagree. The suggestion that only enough land is allocated in Sutton cum Lound for four new houses up to 2028 is considered to be far too low. The suggested figure is based solely on the findings of a Sutton village resident’s survey in which only 66 responses were received to the 319 questionnaires delivered (representing a response rate of 20.69%).
382	11	When asked to indicate the number of new houses that should be provided in the village in broad tranches of 10s, the majority of respondents (45 or 68.2% of the overall 20%) didn’t want any new housing. However 30% or nearly a third of respondents did support growth of between 0-30 houses up to 2028 (14 respondents suggested 0-10 houses, 4 respondents suggested 10-20 houses and 2 respondents suggested 20-30 houses). My client questions what response would be received if the criteria tranches were broader for example: No new houses, 0-5, 6-10, 11-15 16-20 etc.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Responde nt	Comme nt	
382	12	We are highly concerned that the suggested housing distribution targets across the RSC's appear to have been based solely on the findings of the residents' surveys. Resident's may not be well informed or aware of the key findings from the LDF evidence work. It would appear that no consideration has been given to the Bassetlaw DC LDF document: ' <i>Services and Facilities Study</i> ' undertaken in September 2009. Paragraph 10.117 refers to the key findings from the evidence work at Appendix B of the Site Allocation Issues and Options Consultation Paper and it is of concern that the <i>Services and Facilities Study</i> is not referenced at Appendix B. Should the services and facilities for each of the RSC be taken into consideration, the share or distribution of the suggested 10% of the housing growth for Bassetlaw, could well be different.
382	13	According to the information presented Sutton cum Lound has 319 households and is of a similar sized settlement to Elkesley with 347 households, Everton with 318 households and Mattersey with 308 households. Interestingly, based on residents questionnaire feedback, respondents suggests that 11-13 houses should be provided in those villages- a far greater rate than the responding Sutton residents.
382	14	Sutton cum Lound, like a limited number of the other Rural Service Centres, is located only approximately 3 miles from Retford town centre. The extensive and well established rural settlement has a population of approximately 1000 inhabitants, who have access to a variety of local services and facilities including the Village School, Village Hall, part-time Post Office facilities, Village Store, Public House and Parish Church. The village also has excellent links to the wider District especially Retford and therefore can take a higher proportion of the split of anticipated housing growth.
382	15	Our clients landholding (site number 274) which is close to the facilities of the village is an ideal site to accommodate such future housing development.
382	16	It should be noted that a planning application has recently been submitted to the Council to develop part of site number 274. As shown on the attached plan below, this application relates to the parcel of our client's wider landholding within the village envelope. The proposal has been carefully designed so that the proposed private drive can be 'upgraded' to provided access to the wider land in the future.
382	17	The overall subject site (site number 274) offers a logical extension to the built up area of Sutton without encroachment beyond the existing natural developed form of the settlement. Aside from the site owners property on the southern part of the site, barn conversion properties face the paddock across Lound Low Road to the west, the domestic curtilage of the two cottages abuts the eastern boundary and Lound Low Road sweeps around to enclose the northern boundary. Thus the site is enclosed and has a significant road frontage which facilitates viable development unlike most of the other identified sites. The overall site could accommodate in the order of 17 dwellings and development would not extend built up limits of the village since there are already properties to the immediate NE of the site taking frontage to Lound Low Road.
382	18	Sites 276 and 299 are large sites that in visual terms appear somewhat separate from the existing development boundary of the settlement and do not appear to be logical <i>small scale</i> extensions. Costs associated with providing access to and within the land could also raise viability issues.
382	19	Whilst sites 275 and 452 have a lesser visual impact on the character of the surrounding landscape that sites 276 and 299, it would appear that significant areas of mature trees and planting would need to removed to gain access from either Lound Low Road or Portland Place.
382	20	Site 282 and 536 appear to represent backland development
382	21	We agree that 2, 3 and 4 bed properties should be provided to meets the growing needs of the village and as over 85% of respondents suggested that small extensions beyond the development boundary are required to meet these needs. Whilst we agree that in general terms brownfield land should be favoured for development purposes, it should be noted that there are no or limited brown land development opportunities at Sutton cum Lound and therefore small extensions beyond the development boundary are considered necessary.
382	22	Yes we agree that the open spaces identified on the map should be protected.
383	1	I list below my objections to the proposed development in our area. This will remove valuable farmland which will be needed as the food crisis deepens (once its gone its gone)
383	2	Plus brownfield sites should be used first Harworth and Bircotes are asking for mixed developments (so I am told). The land around Moorgate Farm is home to various types of bats, so further light pollution and disturbance will drive them away , this would be affected by sites 512, 37, 533
383	3	Any development on 533 will totally change Durham Grove from quiet cul de sac to a rat run. Our road is narrow with a tight bend to negotiate, we have a drainage problem after heavy rain and this would only get worse.
383	4	The Tiln Lane to Moorgate Road infrastructure is already congested at times extra development can only make this worse. Any change to sites 512, 37, 533 and 7 would create urban sprawl and be outside borough boundary and if carried out could end up with Retford and Clarbrough meeting. Retford has to end somewhere leave it where it does.
383	5	If building has to take place in Retford any mixed use site that are already being used should be extended i.e. 51 and R7. If any other sites are still needed the ones that have main Road access should be chosen
383	6	The number of houses proposed for Retford could come from committed land if numbers are correct
384	1	no comment
384	2	I do not believe that Worksop should be allocated any more growth for housing but the employment growth could be improved by using sites which have already been used for that purpose but unfortunately due to the current climate they have ceased trading and buildings are stood empty.
384	3	I believe all the sites are already over saturated with housing and particularly site 35 is unsuitable.
384	4	as stated in question 2 i believe there is already areas to reinstate as employment sites.
384	5	yes they should all be protected as open spaces. We need green areas for environmental reasons as well as it providing areas for keeping healthy physically and mentally

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
384	6	If there was housing on site 35 there would be a tremendous strain on a road network which is already showing signs of been inadequate for the number of homes it serves. As there are only two ways out of the estate it is very congested in a morning with commuters. Also homes would be overlooked by a new development and loss of privacy would be encountered. There is woodland which would suffer as housing would go right up to the boundary and the number of people then using the area would have a detrimental effect on the wildlife and the eco system.
384	7	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
384	8	I believe existing sites should be adequate and no new locations utilised for this purpose.
384	9	I don't agree with traveller sites been provided at all.
385	1	Traffic Flow - The proposed development on the piece of land between the two Broad Gores will open up the two call-de-sacs, which will in turn enable traffic to take short cuts from Clarborough to Hayton. This is a potential death trap, as access at present to both estates is done so using narrow roads, which is bad enough, but in bad weather they become almost inaccessible. This has the potential to cause fatal accidents, as heavy transport takes the short cuts, and the increased traffic flow.
385	2	Flooding - As you may be aware, during the last two years, Clarborough and Hayton has been subjected to flooding during the bad weather, and to my knowledge, nothing has been done to change this, and with new houses, this isn't going to get done, and many of which will not be able to get insurance.
385	3	Village facilities - Currently, there is no shop, post office, leisure facilities etc within the two villages, this has the potential to increase traffic flow through the village as people need to access these facilities outside the village.
385	4	School - There is currently just one school that supports both villages, this is currently full, how is it proposed that the school will cope with the increase in children, and again the increase in traffic flow as they drop off/pick up at school.
385	5	Crime - At present the crime rate in the villages is very good, if the proposed houses are built this will statistically raise, which in turn will increase house and car insurance as well, and with these economic times, people can't afford a raise.
386	1	The following sites identified in the Blyth Issues and Options consultation document as potential housing sites are crossed by one of National Grid's high voltage overhead electricity transmission lines: Blyth - Sites 213 and 214. National Grid does not own the land over which the overhead lines cross, and it obtains the rights from individual landowners to place our equipment on their land. Potential developers of the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain our existing overhead lines in-situ. Because of the scale, bulk and cost of the transmission equipment required to operate at 400kV National Grid only supports proposals for the relocation of existing high voltage overhead lines where such proposals directly facilitate a major development or infrastructure project of national importance which has been identified as such by central government. Therefore we advise developers and planning authorities to take into account the location and nature of existing electricity transmission equipment when planning developments.
386	2	National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. This is for two reasons, the amenity of potential occupiers of properties in the vicinity of lines and because National Grid needs quick and easy access to carry out maintenance of its equipment to ensure that it can be returned to service and be available as part of the national transmission system. Such access can be difficult to obtain without inconveniencing and disturbing occupiers and residents, particularly where properties are in close proximity to overhead lines. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. To comply with statutory safety clearances the live electricity conductors of National Grid's overhead power lines are designed to be a minimum height above ground. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site. National Grid seeks to encourage high quality and well planned development in the vicinity of its high voltage overhead lines. Land beneath and adjacent to the overhead line route should be used to make a positive contribution to the development of the site and can for example be used for nature conservation, open space, landscaping areas or used as a parking court. National Grid, in association with David Lock Associates has produced 'A Sense of Place' guidelines, which look at how to create high quality development near overhead lines and offers practical solutions which can assist in avoiding the unnecessary sterilisation of land in the vicinity of high voltage overhead lines.
387	1	Agree
387	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
387	3	More than 18 houses are required to help maintain dwindling services in villages, buses, school, shop and pubs
387	4	Site 480, appropriate location and generally brownfield
387	5	Site 480, appropriate location and generally brownfield
387	6	Site needs to be of sufficient scale to include sports/ open space and community facilities
387	7	Yes
387	8	Existing Sites - Sustainability
387	9	Together - Sustainability
387	10	Unknown
388	1	Agree
388	2	Would welcome additional growth in Langold. Number of houses relative to the extent of community benefit and by approval of local community

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
388	3	Site 219/385
388	4	Local residents should be allowed to have input into scale and nature of the development
388	5	Protect open spaces
388	6	Option A
388	7	Existing sites - Sustainability
388	8	Together - Sustainability
388	9	Unknown
389	1	Yes
389	2	Yes 200 houses
389	3	35 I live in gatefold and there are only two ways into the estate, getting in or out at certain times means being stuck in a long queue, any more houses would only make the problem worse
389	4	151 A small infill development like this would be ideal as its scrubland with house round it already
389	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
390	1	Yes
390	2	No, not above what is already required
390	3	Sites 45,26 and 371 I believe will be suitable as there will be little disturbance to local residents and access will be ideal due to the existing large road network in the A57. I believe site 35 site wholly unsuitable for extra housing, as more development and therefore residents will put a huge strain on resources such as schools, roads etc. Loss of households privacy and views, destruction of many areas of natural beauty with loss of hedgerows and wildlife. Also loss of versatile farming land, crops being grown there all year round.
390	4	195,343,w8 Partial use of site 4 and W9 would be suitable also. Away from the existing housing.
390	5	Site 4 and W9 would be ideal in my view for a 60% housing and 20% employment split with 20% left unused.
390	6	Yes
390	7	Area 35 is an area of natural beauty and will be utterly destroyed if any development was to go ahead here, also causing major traffic problems in an already congested area. Area 4 and W9 in my view are the best options.
390	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
390	9	On existing sites to keep the community together.
390	10	Same answer as above
391	1	We think location 35 is unsuitable
391	2	Yes we do think the open spaces identified on the map of location 35 should be protected from any future development proposals
391	3	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
392	1	No
392	2	I think 35 is unsuitable
392	3	Yes
392	4	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
393	1	we do not need any more new build in Worksop, traffic would be chaos
393	2	No more houses this end of town
393	3	None
393	4	None at this end of town
393	5	Yes i bought my house here with the joy of not being overlooked, and for the scenery of the farmland
393	6	There would be too much traffic on Gateford, the school would be overfilled
393	7	Option B: Focused in just one of the above towns?
393	8	REMOVED
393	9	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
393	10	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
393	11	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
393	12	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area.
393	13	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
393	14	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
393	15	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
393	16	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
394	1	Yes
394	2	The town should be allocated more employment growth as it is greatly lacking in this area. More housing is not needed at this time as there are not enough jobs locally to sustain the current population, let alone an increased population.
394	3	Location 35 is NOT suitable for housing. The gatefold area is already large enough.
394	4	Traffic generation would be too severe for the area and the loss of ecological habits, landscapes and wildlife would be unacceptable. There is inadequate infrastructure to support such a development.
394	5	W9, W10, W8, W1 and W12
394	6	W9 and W10 (just employment)
394	7	The potential protected open spaces on the map should all be protected.
394	8	REMOVED
394	9	Yes
394	10	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
394	11	REMOVED
394	12	REMOVED
394	13	REMOVED
395	1	No. Not everybody has been consulted and therefore not been given the opportunity to have an input.
395	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
395	3	No, the village school cannot accommodate any more children and the village infrastructure and roads are already at capacity.
395	4	This question is not relevant as planning is already passed for this development so is irrelevant.
395	5	Why do we need anymore development when corner farm is already larger than the proposal of 12 additional houses
395	6	Yes
395	7	No, the sites currently supplied by the council are under used and there is other private land already occupied by travellers that the council won't give planning for.
396	1	Yes I agree
396	2	I feel the town could benefit from more business growth in particular manufacturing has for housing i already feel the town is stretched with services and the road designs do not allow for any more traffic.
396	3	Area 35 is a bad area for housing it would put even more strain on services
396	4	The access to the site is all ready a traffic hot spot at busy periods
396	5	There are no facilities at all in the properties on the Gateford estates and everyone uses an already very busy Celtic Point
396	6	i also use the footpath regularly and is always in use there is enough derelict sites around Worksop so why strip our beautiful country side
396	7	39 and w10 would be a good location for mixed development there aren't many newish houses to that area and also offices etc.
396	8	Yes
396	9	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
396	10	no
396	11	together
397	1	I do think the screening methodology was rather difficult to understand was made really hard to find on the internet. There will be a lot of people who would like there say but cant get through the first jaunt of the internet. Web page could have been more user friendly.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
397	2	I think there is enough empty houses in Retford and once Retford starts opening shops and business in the empty development we have in and the outskirts of town we should not think of spoiling the little Market Town of Retford. Retford falls in to Ordsall already so why let it fall to sutton, clarborough, welham, and Eaton why lets us lose the views and the green area around which people all come to see .
397	3	If we needed any Houses i think some on the part site on the North Road for employment growth and Grove lane and lever ton road area for housing development which would not affect a lot of people,
397	4	if we could read the numbers on the map, I think you are taking a lot of green area which we need for wildlife and for arable land.
397	5	I don't support anymore site for mixed use in the Retford area.
397	6	Traffic in Retford when the A1 gets blocks is really bad why make it worse. Longholme Road, Tiln Lane are really difficult to get out of at certain times of the day so all the Roads would have to be made wider and paths get smaller - would this be safe for children going to school on Tiln Lane.
397	7	We also have a good wildlife area in between area of the canal and bigsby Road. Trees and hedges which birds and wildlife live.
397	8	Yes i think the open spaces should be protected there is not enough in the area as it is.
397	9	The site between longholme Road and bigsby road and badger chase should be left as they are its a nice area and its nice to walk in to the country side with out much traffic which its good to walk.
398	1	Workshop does not need any more housing and I specifically do not agree with location 35
398	2	Location 35 shown not be developed
398	3	If the council is getting the views of the local community why is this the first I have heard of this consultation and I live adjacent to area 35.
398	4	Workshop is unable to cope with the amount of people that live in it at the moment, you can not get a doctors or dentists appointment for weeks. Getting into Workshop town is impossible on a Saturday and there is not enough parking.
398	5	Option A: Spread between Workshop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
399	1	Option A: Spread between Workshop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
399	2	I strongly disagree. No more dwellings should be allocated in the village.
399	3	There is no more room in the school (children are being taught in corridors) for the children of new houses.
399	4	Too many new dwellings have already been built in recent years.
399	5	There are no employment prospects in the village for any newcomers.
399	6	There is not now even a shop in the village so any newcomers would add to Clarborough and Hayton's carbon footprint by having to travel for even the most basic of shopping requirements.
399	7	No
399	8	I do not think that any sites on the map are suitable.
399	9	I have probably covered these in question 45
399	10	I think the open spaces should be protected.
399	11	There is already a traveller site at Daneshill - why should another be required in the area.
400	1	No I believe the town is big enough.
400	2	Yes. I am opposed to building anything on Area 35 which are the fields to the side of Gateford Hill Nursing Home. The Gateford estate is already big enough.
400	3	The residents value the open fields around them. I for one value it as the most important reason I live here. Many people walk their dogs and this keeps the residents healthy and we have good social interaction doing this.
400	4	Already in a morning there are queues to get out of Ashes Park Avenue and Eddison and this would make matters worse.
400	5	Option A: Spread between Workshop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
401	1	I have no objections to the methodology.
401	2	I believe that the town should be allocated more land for employment growth
401	3	Many families living in the Workshop area, including a high proportion of professionals, commute to work in nearby cities, or larger towns. Current housing levels meet local demand
401	4	New local employment sites generating increased opportunities for professionals, would encourage more local residents to work closer to the area in which they live. This has to be a win-win situation at all levels.
401	5	A high number of properties in the Gateford area of Workshop have been on the market for a significant period of time - properties are not selling well currently. The properties are already priced significantly lower than other local 'commuter' villages/towns. Increased housing;' leading to even lower prices, would therefore make Workshop an exceptionally unattractive proposition for forward thinking family home buyers.
401	6	None - employment sites only.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
401	7	I would strongly argue that location 35 on the Worksop map is completely unsuitable for additional housing development. I, along with a high proportion of home owners in the adjoining area, many of whom are successful professionals, would turn their backs on Worksop for good if this development were to go ahead. The adjoining bridleways, paths, fields and woods were a significant draw for people to move into the area and remain a significant draw to local residents and others who travel to their area. Removal of these areas would cause a significant lowering of the quality of life for local residents, in an already densely populated area. Site 35 should become 'protected open space.' Site 35 is a beautiful area of land. - We need to hang on to attractive areas if we are to increase the appeal of Worksop.
401	8	W13 would appear to be a very good choice - accessible and visible.
401	9	Yes - strongly - along with location 35 - this site also needs to become a protected open space.!
401	10	Far more employment sites need to be identified now. Standards in our local schools appear to be rising - by the time projects are completed - we need to harness the fruits of these improvements - and employ these people in our local area. Too many talented youngsters move away from this area after their education. The area needs to make plans to encourage their retention.
401	11	As above.
401	12	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
401	13	In and around existing, established sites.
401	14	Together - to allow those in travelling communities to share a focal point.
402	1	I am strongly opposed to the planning application for location 35 as it would be detrimental to everyone that lives on this estate and further.
402	2	Apart from being valuable agricultural land, it is used by many people for walking there dogs and numerous leisure pursuits.
402	3	We moved here 7 years ago for a slice of the country and now you want to destroy it, i feel there is no need for 700 new homes on this estate, which will also have the effect of reducing the value of the properties that already exist on the estate.
403	1	I agree the town needs to be developed but concentration should be linked with promoting the use and development of the town centre and not on sites further out of town. Out of the town centre developments will be unlikely to encourage growth of the town centre.
403	2	I think location 35 is unsuitable for development.
403	3	The open space provides valuable walking amenities on its numerous bridleways into natural woodland. The development would ruin this natural provision
403	4	The local amenities are already stretched including the access road (ashes park avenue) onto the main Gateford Road.
403	5	The school is full and the local shops already busy
403	6	When I bought my property I did so knowing that I had open fields to the rear, the Gateford development is already large and I am sure there are other areas of the town which could more appropriately expand without developing picturesque farm land.
403	7	Sites near to the town centre and A57 (Manton Wood) to promote the town and utilise the traffic link provided by the A57 bypass south of the town towards the A1.
403	8	The green areas around Ashes Park Avenue must stay. They provide a vital service to local residents and make the estate more attractive to all.
403	9	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
403	10	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. Any increase in housing on the estate will make this situation intolerable and dangerous to residents and visitors.
403	11	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. Any increase in housing on the estate will make this situation intolerable and dangerous to residents and visitors.
403	12	The area proposed is productive agricultural land farming Wheat and Oilseed rape
403	13	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing placed on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands
403	14	The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
403	15	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily both from the estate and many visiting recreational users. The loss of this countryside would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Plantation
403	16	Our 'local' shops which are sited off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, especially since one of the shops became an ASDA Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas
403	17	Our local schools (primary, secondary and school based nursery's) are already to capacity. Yours faithfully
404	1	Yes
404	2	new housing should come second to more employment opportunities
404	3	I think location 35 is unsuitable
404	4	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
405	1	I consider that Location 35 is unsuitable for potential housing
405	2	further development in Gateford would completely over-stretch the local infrastructure and amenities
405	3	In addition it would significantly increase traffic pollution on already busy local roads and reduce the quality of life for existing residents.
405	4	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
406	1	No comment
406	2	It is not a question of numbers directly. It is more a question of how the local infrastructure can cope with additional homes and the additional residents that it will generate. If there is not a PROPORTIONATE increase in resources such as hospital beds, school places and employment then this proposal could be devastating for the local economy, just the opposite of what the council are attempting to achieve.
406	3	We do not agree with the proposed development on site 35 at Gateford. This is far too large a development.
406	4	There should be an absolute maximum of 200 homes on this site so that there is no huge burden on local resources, facilities and amenities.
406	5	Yes. Definitely. A certain amount of open space needs protecting to ensure that the environment is protected for all.
406	6	No
406	7	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
406	8	Together in order to contain any issues.
407	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
408	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
409	1	no not at the present time there is a lot of empty houses in the town and people can not afford to buy, employment growth should be tackled first so people can then buy said houses
409	2	I feel it would be very short sighted to build on location 35,the roads around this area are already clogged up at peak times and several accidents have occurred due to this
409	3	Parents are already struggling to get their children into the local schools and this will surely put the schools and local parents under more pressure
409	4	The woodlands at the location are a natural and free source of recreation for all people of all ages living around this area ,why do we keep destroying our natural habitat to build even more housing that we do not need in the current climate.
409	5	This area has a lot of power cuts and limited internet connection due to the amount of property already here, so why build more .and 618 more houses is surely going to make a big impact on the gatefold estate.
409	6	This is a lovely place to live but is regular threatened by plans of one sort or another .we have a very nice community to live in SO WHY SPOIL IT
409	7	i think all open spaces should be protected they are a natural resource
409	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
409	9	in and around existing sites, as it keeps their community in one area
410	1	need more employment before any more houses are built in the area and school are already full and running out of space
410	2	I think location 35 is unsuitable for new housing as its not needed before any more houses are built in gatefold
410	3	gatefold we need more new business and better shopping centre and more school provision
410	4	I think we need more green land around Worksop and its a shame to reduce the areas to walk for houses that will not sell easily in the current market we need more jobs potential first.
410	5	the site near the lockkeeper need developing a new supermarket and bowling extra places for kids to go instead of wondering the streets causing trouble
410	6	need open space important places to walk and park areas
410	7	Option B
410	8	REMOVED
410	9	None
411	1	I do think the town would benefit from more housing, however there are many large derelict areas around the town which should be used before greenfield sites are considered
411	2	I DO NOT want to see houses being built on site 35,
411	3	it is unsuitable to add more houses to this area of Gateford, because the 2 exits, onto Carlton and Gateford roads are very congested now at peak times
411	4	also it would mean the destruction of agricultural land, the loss of well used footpaths and destruction of hedgerows
411	5	I would NOT support any mixed use sites other than housing and light retail.
411	6	Industry can present dangers to the public, both in terms of heavy transport and commercial activity, noise etc., and therefore should not be mixed with housing
411	7	I would like to see site 35 protected from any development since it is greenfield agricultural land
412	1	At the present time, Worksop has too many employers offering low paid jobs will limited hours per contract. There is a need for quality employment that would attract a better class of employee who would value the environment and make an enhancing contribution to the local community. We have far too many distribution type employers and a lack of manufacturing companies offering skilled opportunities in the high tech and engineering sectors.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
412	2	Locations 35 & 8 are unsuitable for an additional 765 properties due to traffic congestion unless an additional road access was constructed onto Gateford Road. It is very difficult already accessing Gateford Road front Ashes Park Road. If additional access was provided then it would be of considerable interest to existing residents of Gateford to be advised on the types of proposed properties i.e. the mix of privately owned to social housing dwellings.
412	3	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
413	1	I think Location 35 is unsuitable and am most strongly against it, I don't want our wonderful countryside destroying.
413	2	I would further add that this land is part of the gatefold park estate and would suggest that the new owners have bought the nursing home just to acquire this land, I am disgusted by this!
413	3	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
414	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable and would not like to see any more building work carried out in this area.
414	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
415	1	Regarding Location 35 (land near Gateford Nursing home & associated fields) is unsuitable.
415	2	It is a great area for walkers, cyclist & horse riders.
415	3	I live at 24 Greenwood close and have open views of these fields. I would object to any planning permission to this area
415	4	In addition, if 700 more homes were built - what would happen with the infrastructure - the roads in/out are busy now, the local schools cannot accommodate all the child places required, and the green lands and nature areas would be destroyed. Surely, there are enough brown fields sites available?
415	5	The open spaces at the side of Ashes Park Avenue should be maintained.
415	6	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
415	7	In one area around existing sites
416	1	Employment is required to help develop the town. However, building new homes first is putting the cart before the horse. What is required is investment into the local Business and Industries to create more jobs rather than building the homes and hoping that the jobs will come later.
416	2	Location 35 is unsuitable - the road infrastructure is already suffering.
416	3	Water pressure in the local already requires power showers (even in the recently built houses)
416	4	congestion will create additional safety issues
416	5	A lot of open space (Green land) has already been developed. The issue of usage is one that affects all of us and therefore requires a full and open enquiry to establish how these developments are to be built sympathetic to the local area, what type of housing is going to be built, what eco systems will be built to support additional housing and what additional infrastructure is to be put in place to ensure that there is adequate support systems in place
416	6	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
416	7	REMOVED
416	8	REMOVED
417	1	Yes
417	2	Worksop does not have enough facilities to cater for the current number of residents so no more housing should be allocated on this basis
417	3	I think location 35 is unsuitable due to the limited infrastructure in gaining access to and from the site.
417	4	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
417	5	REMOVED
417	6	REMOVED
418	1	I think that Location 35 is unsuitable
418	2	A potential of an additional 700 homes, with the limited access to the main roads will cause tremendous traffic problems, especially onto Gateford Road (the main access to the A57).
418	3	In addition, the site appears to cover the public footpaths accessing the local woods for walking and these right-of-ways need to be maintained
418	4	It is also currently agricultural land, would it not be better to use the redundant old Vesuvius site (not considered within the consultation document) to cater for additional housing and/or business requirements rather than sacrifice further greenbelt areas.
418	5	Location 4/W9 - I prefer Options 3 & 4 if this areas has to be developed, as it would have a lower environmental impact on the area.
418	6	The old Vesuvius site off Sandy Lane.
418	7	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
419	1	I think location 35 is UNSUITABLE for housing development for the following reasons:
419	2	the Gateford area already has difficulties in providing school places
419	3	the volume of traffic coming onto and off the estate would cause congestion
419	4	where are all these people going to get jobs from in an area where people are all ready struggling to find employment, my daughter included
419	5	I chose to move into the Gateford area because of the immediate access to the open countryside, building more houses here would spoil the open feeling to the area

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
419	6	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
420	1	I believe employment growth and infrastructure is important in the Worksop area but building more houses would put pressure on the already stretched infrastructure we have in the Worksop area.
420	2	Location 35 is wholly unsuitable for housing, this beautiful open area would be destroyed.
420	3	There is precious little infrastructure in the area to support the already large number of houses in Gateford and 700 more would be impossible.
420	4	I think the proposed protected open spaces are suitable and logical.
420	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
420	6	New Gypsy and traveller sites should be located in the area of existing sites, this would lead to a greater sense of community for these groups.
421	1	I believe the use of green belt land will be detrimental to the town & communities as a whole.
421	2	No. Numerous developments have already been built in & around the town. If it is decided to build further housing, then use brown field rather than green field sites, there are plenty of brown field locations around Worksop.
421	3	I don't believe Worksop needs more houses.
421	4	Certainly unsuitable I would consider green belt land locations. 35 (UNSUITABLE) - destroying green belt, increasing already busy road network.
421	5	Location 30 UNSUITABLE - destroying green belt & next to nature reserve.
421	6	Location 9 - again destroying farmland.
421	7	W12 existing area for employment, also with good road network.
421	8	Only if they prevented green field sites being used. In which case 39 & W10 would at least not load up the already busy A57.
421	9	The open spaces 2/83 on the Gateford estate should be protected, as the estate is already large with building threatened on the surrounding green field location 35. To put more houses & traffic on an already very large estate & busy road network, destroying some of the limited areas for walking in green areas & along bridle paths would be a travesty for this part of the town.
421	10	I think existing brown field should be the priority if housing/building is to take place in Worksop. Destroying more green field areas is not justified. Worksop already has plenty of housing estates, the low value of properties in the area shows that there is no great push for housing in this area. The focus should be on new employment to regenerate the town, not more housing for commuters.
421	11	Option A
421	12	Stay in existing areas where the facilities are already focused.
421	13	Together, to put all the resources together.
422	1	Yes
422	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
422	3	Yes
422	4	228 and 483
422	5	Stay in and around existing sites
422	6	Together
423	1	Site reference number 35, is unsuitable because of the lack of infrastructure.
423	2	There is only one road running in and out of the estate, which at peak times can see traffic stacked up from Gateford road to the first roundabout. Just think what the school run will be like with another 618 parents queuing up to get onto Gateford road. Which brings me onto the timing of the traffic survey I saw happening on the estate last year. I'm sure it was done during school holidays and only lasted a day if I recall correctly. This ineffective and biased survey will give the Council false results on road usage on the estate which I hope they will rectify.
423	3	Speaking of school runs, the density of housing in the area far outstretches the capacity of the local schools in the area. I know this because when I was sourcing a school for my children, Gateford school had port-a-cabins in the playground with plans to merge with the school next door. Even playtimes had to be staggered due to overcrowding. Plus where are the supporting buildings? like community buildings. Surely the big plan is to increase the feeling of community and not blot the landscape with six foot high fencing around 618 new houses.
423	4	Option A
424	1	Cannot answer the question as the criteria on the screening methodology was not provided.
424	2	I would not like to see additional growth other than has been agreed as this would be detrimental to the identity of the current local communities, put a strain on the local infrastructure and environment
424	3	The need should not arise if existing brownfield and current housing areas are carefully designed and built within Worksop. What is not required is dormitory areas occupied by people who do not work in the area and do not integrate into the community.
424	4	The existing infrastructure including utilities are at best satisfactory and without significant upgrading and investment could not sustain an expansion of the current housing stock.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
424	5	The area suffers from regular power cuts, flooding of the A60 at the junction with Lawn Road and Doncaster Road together with the road outside my property, and general overflow from drains in the area during prolonged heavy rainfall. The last of which poses a health hazard to the community. As I write this response the area has suffered a power cut again! 2nd this week.
424	6	All the open spaces identified on the map should be protected from development
424	7	Option A bearing in mind there is little point in allocating housing into a rural area without a fully supported infrastructure of shops, services, buses etc.
424	8	REMOVED
424	9	REMOVED
424	10	REMOVED
425	1	The site that raises concerns from our position and situation would of course be the one that would have most direct impact on our own lives and daily outlook namely the land adjacent to, behind and running alongside, Rutland Road, London Road and Grove Road respectively.
425	2	This area has we understand already been the subject of planning applications and these have always been refused on the same grounds that namely is it a floodplain often with standing water of 50 to 100mm above ground due to the very high water table and an already overburdened water run off causing flooding damage to properties on Grove Lane, Trent Street, Blackstope Lane and Rutland Road to name a few within the local area. Much of this flooding is due to the excessive water run off from Grove Hills, land which could not be altered to reduce this problem. Indeed in 2007 the water run off was so severe that it was highly dangerous to the local inhabitants at the bottom of Grove Lane when the water run off in the water courses was seen to be unable to find sufficient passage through the drains under the road and was shooting upwards from the immense pressure building up behind to well over head height.
425	3	We would also add that Bracken Lane School serving the area suffers from its sports field being waterlogged many months of the year and difficulty with the drains this has been first hand knowledge as our children attended the school it is we understand also currently almost full to capacity with little realistic prospect to expend.
425	4	We would also like to point out that the road system in the area is already overburdened and any further development would cause further chaos when trying to get from the various housing developments already in place and onto London Road this can result in waits of 15 to 20 minutes in peak times. This would be no better if the traffic was routed via Grove Road due to the already problematic level crossing.
426	1	No we do not believe Retford needs anymore allocated housing. it is very obvious Retford has enough vacant properties.
426	2	if only sites would actively benefit from more properties, we believe sites 342, 10, 70 and 71. These sites would benefit as they are already in the town centre and already have good access roads.
426	3	For employment related development we believe site 51 would be much a better choice as there is already existing businesses, so it would make more sense expanding the current location. Especially as it is nearer to the town centre.
426	4	We feel there is a lot of relevant issues developing from the proposed housing allocation of sites especially from the general public it will effect. Some of the issues that have arisen, which we believe will be made worse if development was to go ahead are services. Such as emergency services will struggle to cover a larger area even more than usual especially with cut backs made.
426	5	Also health services such as doctors and dentists will not be able to cope with a sudden impact.
426	6	The roads won't be able to cope with the mass of traffic.
426	7	Plus more traffic will cause unnecessary damage to the environment.
426	8	Sites 364, 41, 1, 52 and 40 need to be protected as they are believed to be on the flight path for both Gamston and Robin Hood airport.
426	9	Also sites 364 and 41 need to be protected to save the wildlife there
426	10	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
426	11	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
426	12	There will be a significant loss of amenity
426	13	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
426	14	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
426	15	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
427	1	Overdevelopment – how many empty properties, including new builds are there in Retford Area? What demands would there be for the excessive number of new builds that are in Bassetlaw District Plans?
427	2	Retford area is poorly industrialised – there would be no work available to sustain incoming inhabitants
427	3	The intended area of development on Tiln Lane, north of Badgers Chase i.e. 230 houses and the development of 900 houses north of Durham Grove, Palmer Road, Bigby Road and Park Lane. A further 900 houses will have an obvious impact on road safety for the whole surrounding area of Tiln Lane, Smeath Lane to Claborough and Welham Road to Claborough.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
427	4	In the absence of the construction of a Clarborough by-pass relief road which has been under consideration for several years but continually side lined, the route for HGVs etc. avoiding the low railway bridge is both dangerous for local residents, especially school children of Carr Hill School and hazardous to motorists in view of the narrow road and dangerous bends, the likelihood of an increase in accident rate because of extra traffic, road junctions etc. would be high.
427	5	Being a dog owner myself, the size of 2 developments would diminish the availability of open rural areas where we can safely allow a dog to exercise. The menace of dog fouling in public areas is already not acceptable, but the irresponsibility of some dog owners allowing their pets to foul pavements etc. would significantly increase.
427	6	There was no information forthcoming from the council offers that any consideration has yet been given to the provision of an adequate relief highway route to Gainsborough to absorb any increase in local traffic density as a result of this development.
427	7	I was given to understand that these developments involve building outside of the existing development envelope and outside the borough boundary.
427	8	Being a local resident in this location I am often inconvenienced by the volume of HGVs and through traffic on Tiln Lane, the inability to exit Tiln Lane onto Moorgate and particularly dense localised traffic driving Carr Hill School arrivals and departure periods. This will only worsen.
428	1	Option A
428	2	We do not agree that houses should be built in Rampton on the grounds that there is no employment in the area and would mean that such houses would be occupied the commuters to Retford and beyond causing an increase in road traffic.
428	3	If we must have them they should be built on area 228 and/or the area on the opposite side of Treswell Road backing on to Birch Close
428	4	No
428	5	Yes
428	6	In and around existing sites. The one on Cottam Road appears to meet the current need
428	7	We have no opinion on this question
428	8	No knowledge of such land
428	9	On objections – makes sense close to existing ribbon development near by.
428	10	Why not look at using the area we have indicated on the plan on the opposite side of the road backing onto Birch Close
428	11	Surely this is land designated for the children's play area and sports fields
428	12	This area is opposite the playing fields and would cause traffic danger to the children
428	13	As stated in the answer to question 101, there is little employment opportunities in the village other than at Cottam Power Station and Rampton Hospital.
428	14	Additional commuter traffic would increase the danger to children which is not acceptable
429	1	We do not believe that the town should consider allocating land for large scale housing development or industry unless there is a strong indicated demand.
429	2	Initially site 51 – there is good access to the Great North Road
429	3	Initially site 51 – there is good access to the Great North Road
429	4	Initially site 51 – there is good access to the Great North Road
429	5	Re: sites 259, 41, 40, 521, 21 these sites appear to us totally inappropriate for large scale development whether for housing or employment because:
429	6	The land is prime agricultural land
429	7	The road to the A1 is little more than a country lane with several dangerous bends. Development of this site would lead to a massive increase in traffic. Similarly increased traffic to Babworth and Worksop would lead to hazards especially around Ordsall Primary School.
429	8	Existing bungalows adjacent to the site would be severely overshadowed and overlooked leading to loss of privacy. The lie of the land would exacerbate this.
429	9	Ecological effect. Cuckoos (lapwings) return to these fields each spring. It is one of the few places in Retford that one hears their strange cries and sees their equally odd flight.
429	10	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
429	11	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
429	12	There will be a significant loss of amenity
429	13	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
429	14	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
429	15	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
430	1	The sites 37 and 512 on Tiln Lane are outside the existing development and other sites within the town limits should be considered before using up such greenfield land.
430	2	Tiln Lane suffers heavy HGV traffic congestion as vehicles avoid the low bridge at Clarborough. When school children are entering and leaving Carr Hill Scholl on Tin Lane parents' cars add further congestion often blocking access/egress completely and making a most dangerous situation. This is a situation which only would be made worse by extra dwelling on the proposed site.
430	3	The sites 37 and 512 stand on higher ground than the existing housing on Badgers Chase and therefore any buildings on this site would adversely affect the existing homes and cause a visual scar.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
431	1	It is now well over 2 years since the Strategic Review of Housing needs in Bassetlaw was implemented. In the meantime the economic basis upon which national, local and personal plans have been formulated has also altered in such a substantial way that I do not consider all the implications have been realised and that all previous assumptions as to growth, demand and financing have been set at naught. All such matters as site allocation issues should be reconsidered at the start as the current consultation must now be based on a false premise and, therefore, be worthless. It is further noted that the consultation document does not give any information as to how the need for additional housing is ascertained making detailed observations on this point difficult.
431	2	The document does not provide any analysis on the availability of brownfield sites or the utilisation of the existing housing stock to meet further demand (if any). Detailed consideration of these matters should be given before any attempt is made to progress matters.
431	3	The sites 37 and 512 on Tiln Lane Retford stick out like a sore thumb from the existing development envelope. An overwhelming demand, which I submit, does not and will not exist for the foreseeable future would be required before this site should even be considered for any type of development.
431	4	The use of Tiln Lane, including that part of the road fronting this site by HGVs making a detour to avoid the low railway bridge at Clarborough, means that highway and road safety considerations logically rule out this site unless and until (a) an alternative route for these vehicles is established and (b) the highway is improved in any event. I notice that the sites under consideration to the East of Tiln Lane are not contiguous there with and could not, or at least should not be reasonably, be given access to Tiln Lane without a drastic change to the character of the area and loss of amenity to the existing development.
431	5	The site of Carr Hill School on Tiln Lane represents a considerable road safety hazard in particular at child delivery and collection times and any further development will only add to the congestion and the road safety hazard.
431	6	The topography means that any development of site 37 however carefully planned will have an unjustified adverse impact on the existing developments in the area.
431	7	I have read the objection prepared by Mr J. Headland. I concur with his comments except that I have no knowledge as to the agricultural quality of the land. You will be able to check on this point when taking his observations into account.
432	1	With regard to your planning proposal at end of Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane I would like to register my objection.
432	2	I site water drainage which is at present inadequate (recent flooding of Grove Lane) and access.
432	3	Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane are woefully congested with traffic at present.
433	1	Yes
433	2	Yes too dense a development
433	3	161
433	4	It would be good to have a post office back. General store, pub with eating facilities
433	5	No use the ones they have already got
433	6	Together keep them in one area
433	7	Our biggest concern in Clarborough is the probability of flooding, which we experienced in 2007. We feel that an extra development of several houses could exacerbate this. June 2007 was an extremely stressful time for us and our flooding was enhanced by the number of cars driving down Big Lane in a rush to get home by their properties.
434	1	Our biggest concern in Clarborough is the probability of flooding, which we experienced in June 2007. We feel that an extra development of several houses could exacerbate this. June 2007 was an extremely stressful time for us and the flooding was enhanced by the number of cars driving down Big Lane in a rush to get home to their properties.
435	1	I do not think that Worksop, and in particular Shireoaks, should be allocated more housing growth because there are already too many large housing developments and empty homes across the town.
435	2	If further housing development is necessary then this should only be small development sites i.e. up to 30 units. With regard to employment sites this should take place in the existing employment area. In particular the Vesuvius site should cover this.
435	3	I do not object to seeing site 26 and site 151 developed for housing.
435	4	Also site 2/128 as this would be a continuation of the development at Woodend.
435	5	I object to all of the proposed housing (other than those referred to above) around Shireoaks as it is not large enough to take further development.
435	6	There is only one access road through the village, parking is already a major problem along this road.
435	7	The village facilities are not sufficient to stand further development and the school does not have enough capacity for additional places.
435	8	The level crossing also causes problems with the flow of traffic.
435	9	I do not think that the development of site 561 is suitable for housing as it only has a single access road.
435	10	I object to the development of all the mixed use sites around Shireoaks for the reasons above.
435	11	I agree with the protection of all the open spaces you have identified.
435	12	With the exception of site 70/7. This play area is not used by children as it is away from their homes and the village, the access is off the busy main road and it is not visible from houses. This site could be used for a small housing development of bungalows which are greatly needed in the village and which in turn would free up family accommodation if the new bungalows were made available only to existing village residents.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
435	13	There is also an area of land between the bungalows and the sports and social club on Shireoaks Road which is an eyesore and could be developed for a continuation of bungalows.
435	14	Additional development should take place in Retford, Harworth and Bircotes.
435	15	The Gypsy and Traveller sites should be concentrated in and around the existing sties. The Gypsy and Traveller community are aware of and use these sites which are easily accessible to them on their 'travelling routes'.
436	1	No consultation with residents was carried out prior to the production of the proposal
436	2	The character of the area would be changed from a quiet residential area to a busy congested area that has not got the infrastructure to support it.
436	3	At a time when the population of the country is growing at an alarming rate, food production takes on a more important role than ever in the economy. How can it be right to utilise good agricultural land for housing development?
436	4	All brownfield sites should be developed for housing before considering developing the edge of town and beyond the borough boundary.
436	5	A large area of the proposed development is low lying (approx. 20ft above sea level) and takes excess rainwater from the surrounding hills and farmland. Property built on this land would be in serious danger of flooding.
436	6	Installing adequate drainage facilities for this area would be virtually impossible.
436	7	There is more than enough traffic movement during peak periods in the Welham Road/Tiln Lane/Bigsby Road areas at present without making the situation worse with the proposed development.
436	8	The outlook over the adjacent land and the privacy of existing properties would be lost.
436	9	The ecological impact on wildlife would be devastating
436	10	Highway safety would be jeopardised
437	1	Spread between Worksop and Harworth Bircotes
437	2	Yes 18 – 30
437	3	480
437	4	Due to the terrible smell from "Tunnel Tech" I think there will be a problem selling houses in Misson
437	5	No
437	6	REMOVED
438	1	I am currently seeking to re-locate to the North Wheatley area to be nearer to my place of work in Gainsborough. I have looked at the properties currently available but there is nothing I could afford to buy.
438	2	I believe that there is a need for affordable housing in the village which need is probably in excess of the 12 dwellings proposed. I am sure that there are many people in the same position as myself, both older and younger, who would like to either move into, or stay, the village but are unable to due to a lack of affordable properties.
438	3	As a matter of personal preference, having considered the nominated sites, I believe the development sites to the East of the village to be most appropriate, particularly those already served by existing roads (464, 236 and part of 237)
438	4	Part of the reason I would like to move to the village is the continued existence of open spaces. I believe it is therefore important that such spaces are retained
439	1	I have looked at the feedback questionnaire and do not believe that 12 houses is sufficient.
439	2	I live in Gainsborough with my partner and child. We would like to move to North Wheatley but there are no houses within our price range of £180,000 to £230,000.
439	3	We know the village and feel that site 464 affords the best site as any development will be concealed and not have any visual impact on the village or the views which I know.
439	4	The village has excellent facilities which appeal to both of us.
439	5	We like North Wheatley because of the open spaces shown on the plan and it is these that make it such an attractive village and these should be kept as should the views over some other sites, especially 239
440	1	I think plot 114 would be an ideal plot to develop
441	1	I would like to see plot 114 developed the land is currently an eyesore that would be much improved with affordable housing for local people and their families
442	1	Develop plot 114
443	1	I would like to see plot 114 developed.
444	1	Yes
444	2	Yes
444	3	West
444	4	Develop plot 114
445	1	Plot 114 for development
446	1	I would like to see Plot 114 Developed
446	2	the opposite side of the road has been developed and looks much better than it did.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
446	3	The village always needs affordable housing, as it is a fast growing village.
447	1	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford.
447	2	The existing Highway Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic. HGV's have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times, leading to safety issues for road users and school children
447	3	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
447	4	The character of this part of Retford will be changed, for the worse, by the proposed development.
447	5	We strongly object to the proposal for this plot to be developed and request that approval be refused. It appears that there have been meetings, discussions and decisions made without any consultation with residents prior to the production of the proposal. This, we fee, is totally unacceptable.
447	6	The road on Durham Grove is just 16 feet wide and blocked off at the end. We feel sure that it was built this way to cater just for the amount of traffic generated by the number of properties as it stands today, with very little thought of it ever opened up, as the field of which plot 533 is part is good agricultural land, which would be lost.
447	7	Further, we believe that any properties built would be outside the existing development envelope and much too close to a Listed Building.
447	8	If Durham Grove is opened up and up to fifteen properties are built, it would not cope safely with the possibility of thirty more cars owned by the residents, plus relations, visitors, traders, workmen etc., visiting these properties, pointing to the fact that the present road infrastructure is unsuitable for such development.
447	9	There is no provision for parking, other than the drives on the residents' properties.
447	10	The road is just wide enough for two medium sized vans to pass safely. If a lorry is parked and another lorry has to pass it to drive partly on the pavement. It is common practice for visiting vehicles to be parked partly on the pavement.
447	11	As well as being extremely narrow, there are two potential safety hazards at the entrance to Durham Grove, namely, two dangerous right angled corners. If plot 7 at end of Palmer Road is approved, there will be more congestion at the junction where Durham Grove joins Palmer Road.
447	12	The drainage system seems inadequate. If there is a prolonged and heavy downpour the road floods well above the level of the pavement and the garden at the side of no 17 remains flooded for several days after the road has cleared. This situation has occurred on a number of occasions since we came to live here in 1983.
447	13	If construction workers were allowed to park on Durham Grove and there were visitors and workmen at the residents properties, it would be very awkward for the construction vehicles to get through. Two lorries cannot pass without driving onto the pavement, which would be a safety hazard for pedestrians.
447	14	If, as is normal today, two or three storey properties were to be built, it would completely change the appearance and character of Durham Grove. In our opinion, this would be totally unacceptable.
447	15	Tiln Lane is not a main road, but a country lane. At present it has to cope with heavy goods vehicles, due to the low bridge at Welham, and Carr Hill School. This already causes chaos at certain times and any further increase in traffic could cause even gridlock and create safety problems for school children, whose safety should certainly be a priority at all time.
448	1	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford.
448	2	The existing Highway Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic. HGV's have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times, leading to safety issues for road users and school children
448	3	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
448	4	The character of this part of Retford will be changed, for the worse, by the proposed development.
448	5	We strongly object to the proposal for this plot to be developed and request that approval be refused. It appears that there have been meetings, discussions and decisions made without any consultation with residents prior to the production of the proposal. This, we fee, is totally unacceptable.
448	6	The road on Durham Grove is just 16 feet wide and blocked off at the end. We feel sure that it was built this way to cater just for the amount of traffic generated by the number of properties as it stands today, with very little thought of it ever opened up, as the field of which plot 533 is part is good agricultural land, which would be lost.
448	7	Further, we believe that any properties built would be outside the existing development envelope and much too close to a Listed Building.
448	8	If Durham Grove is opened up and up to fifteen properties are built, it would not cope safely with the possibility of thirty more cars owned by the residents, plus relations, visitors, traders, workmen etc., visiting these properties, pointing to the fact that the present road infrastructure is unsuitable for such development.
448	9	There is no provision for parking, other than the drives on the residents' properties.
448	10	The road is just wide enough for two medium sized vans to pass safely. If a lorry is parked and another lorry has to pass it to drive partly on the pavement. It is common practice for visiting vehicles to be parked partly on the pavement.
448	11	As well as being extremely narrow, there are two potential safety hazards at the entrance to Durham Grove, namely, two dangerous right angled corners. If plot 7 at end of Palmer Road is approved, there will be more congestion at the junction where Durham Grove joins Palmer Road.
448	12	The drainage system seems inadequate. If there is a prolonged and heavy downpour the road floods well above the level of the pavement and the garden at the side of no 17 remains flooded for several days after the road has cleared. This situation has occurred on a number of occasions since we came to live here in 1983.
448	13	If construction workers were allowed to park on Durham Grove and there were visitors and workmen at the residents properties, it would be very awkward for the construction vehicles to get through. Two lorries cannot pass without driving onto the pavement, which would be a safety hazard for pedestrians.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
448	14	If, as is normal today, two or three storey properties were to be built, it would completely change the appearance and character of Durham Grove. In our opinion, this would be totally unacceptable.
448	15	Tiln Lane is not a main road, but a country lane. At present it has to cope with heavy goods vehicles, due to the low bridge at Welham, and Carr Hill School. This already causes chaos at certain times and any further increase in traffic could cause even gridlock and create safety problems for school children, whose safety should certainly be a priority at all time.
449	1	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford.
449	2	The existing Highway Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic
449	3	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
449	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road users and school children. HGV's have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
450	1	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford.
450	2	The existing Highway Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic
450	3	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
450	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road users and school children. HGV's have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
451	1	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford.
451	2	The existing Highway infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic. HGVs have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times. This, and the increased traffic from any development will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane, particularly at School times, leading to safety issues for road users and school children.
451	3	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
451	4	The character of this part of Retford will be changed, for the worse, by the proposed development.
452	1	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford.
452	2	The existing Highway Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic
452	3	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
452	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road users and school children. HGV's have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
453	1	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford.
453	2	The existing Highway Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic
453	3	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
453	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road users and school children. HGV's have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
454	1	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford.
454	2	The existing Highway Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic. HGV's have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times, leading to safety issues for road users and school children
454	3	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
454	4	The character of this part of Retford will be changed, for the worse, by the proposed development.
455	1	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford.
455	2	The existing Highway Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic
455	3	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
455	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road users and school children. HGV's have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
456	1	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford.
456	2	The existing Highway Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic. HGV's have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times, leading to safety issues for road users and school children
456	3	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
456	4	The character of this part of Retford will be changed, for the worse, by the proposed development.
457	1	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford
457	2	The existing Highway Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
457	3	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
457	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road users and school children. HGV's have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
458	1	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford
458	2	The existing Highway Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic
458	3	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
458	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road users and school children. HGV's have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
459	1	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford
459	2	The existing Highway Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic. HGV's have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times, leading to safety issues for road users and school children
459	3	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
459	4	The character of this part of Retford will be changed, for the worse, by the proposed development.
460	1	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford
460	2	The existing Highway Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic
460	3	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
460	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road users and school children. HGV's have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
461	1	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford
461	2	The existing Highway infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic. HGVs have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times. This, and the increased traffic from any development will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane, particularly at School times, leading to safety issues for road users and school children.
461	3	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
461	4	The character of this rural part of Retford will be changed, for the worse, by the proposed development, and there is no necessity to build outside the borough boundary.
461	5	There has been no consultation with local residents prior to production of the proposal. Only after the circulation, has a notice appeared on the street furniture.
462	1	I wish to object to the above proposals for plans to develop 231 houses on the north side of Badgers Chase, Retford
462	2	The existing Highway infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic. HGVs have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing. This and the increased traffic from any development will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane, particularly at school times, leading to safety issues for road users and school children
462	3	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
462	4	The character of this rural part of Retford will be changed, for the worse, by the proposed development, and there is no necessity to build outside the borough boundary.
462	5	There has been no consultation with local residents prior to production of the proposal. Only after the circulation, has a notice appeared on the street furniture.
463	1	I am aware that Bassetlaw District Council propose that the fields on the North side of Badgers Close be developed for housing purposes. Consequently, please accept this letter as my formal objection to any such development. The basis of my objection is as stated below.
463	2	The whole character of the area would be altered for ever by this proposed development. The present residential areas are within the borough boundary, fronting onto open countryside and consist of well proportioned large family homes, as are the majority of the houses along Tiln Lane and Welham Road.
463	3	The existing Highway infrastructure would clearly not be able to cope safely and functionally with the inevitable increase in traffic. In term time, at Carr hill school. There is currently considerable traffic congestion at delivery and collection times, as children enter and leave school.
463	4	Good crop producing agricultural land would be lost at a time when there must be poorer land available that is equally suitable for housing development.
463	5	All brownfield sites should be developed prior to developing on the edge of town or outside of the borough boundary.
463	6	There would be added traffic dangers to other road users besides the risks imparted to the school children. The ever increasing numbers of HGV's using Tiln Lane (to avoid the low bridge at Welham) has already exacerbated the present risks due to the attendant traffic congestion.
463	7	The above development proposal involves building outside of the present development envelope. This is unnecessary because there are plenty of infill sites within the borough
463	8	There has been no consultation with local residents prior to your producing your Core Strategy.
463	9	There does not seem to be any good reason, therefore, to propose to develop outside of existing development envelope, thus spoiling the Northern end of Retford with unnecessary housing. The present entrance to Retford from Clabourough gives a very pleasing impression of a well cared for and prosperous town and it is my intention that it remains that way.
464	1	I am aware that Bassetlaw District Council propose that the fields on the North side of Badgers Close be developed for housing purposes. Consequently, please accept this letter as my formal objection to any such development. The basis of my objection is as stated below.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
464	2	The whole character of the area would be altered for ever by this proposed development. The present residential areas are within the borough boundary, fronting onto open countryside and consist of well proportioned large family homes, as are the majority of the houses along Tiln Lane and Welham Road.
464	3	The existing Highway infrastructure would clearly not be able to cope safely and functionally with the inevitable increase in traffic. In term time, at Carr hill school. There is currently considerable traffic congestion at delivery and collection times, as children enter and leave school.
464	4	Good crop producing agricultural land would be lost at a time when there must be poorer land available that is equally suitable for housing development.
464	5	All brownfield sites should be developed prior to developing on the edge of town or outside of the borough boundary.
464	6	There would be added traffic dangers to other road users besides the risks imparted to the school children. The ever increasing numbers of HGV's using Tiln Lane (to avoid the low bridge at Welham) has already exacerbated the present risks due to the attendant traffic congestion.
464	7	The above development proposal involves building outside of the present development envelope. This is unnecessary because there are plenty of infill sites within the borough
464	8	There has been no consultation with local residents prior to your producing your Core Strategy.
464	9	There does not seem to be any good reason, therefore, to propose to develop outside of existing development envelope, thus spoiling the Northern end of Retford with unnecessary housing. The present entrance to Retford from Claborough gives a very pleasing impressing of a well cared for and prosperous town and it is my intention that it remains that way.
465	1	I am writing to object to the above proposal for the following reasons: a) the addition of 230 dwellings will certainty affect he character of the area, insofar as development of well-proportionate family houses and the local manor house
465	2	The existing highway infrastructure is presently subject to high stress due to the constant passage in both directions of very heavy vehicles along Tiln Lane, together with the serious congestions occurring twice daily at Carr Hill primary school. Additional traffic will seriously aggravate the situation with consequent hazards.
465	3	The proposed site appears to be good crop producing land. The loss f which would be contrary to general common sense, especially when non-productive brownfield sites abound locally
465	4	It is suggested that the above objections constitute three very good reasons for the rejection of this proposal
466	1	I am writing to object to the above proposal for the following reasons:
466	2	a) the addition of 230 dwellings will certainly affect the character if the area in so far as the existing housing consists mainly of small development of well proportioned family houses and the local manor house.
466	3	b) the existing highway infrastructure is presently subject to high stress due to the consistent package in both directions of very heavy vehicles along Tiln Lane, together with the serious congestion occurring twice daily at Carr Hill primary school. Extra traffic will seriously aggravate the situation with consequent hazards.
466	4	The proposed site appears to be good crop producing land, the loss of which would be contrary to general common sense, especially when non-productive brown filed sites abound locally.
466	5	It is suggested that the above constitute three very good reasons for the rejection of this proposal.
467	1	I wish the register my objection to the proposed development of 240 houses adjacent to Badgers Chase (sites 37 and 512 land north of Retford). My objections are based on the following points:
467	2	a) The number of proposed houses will significantly alter the character of the area and detract from it, by creating a pocket of high density in an area of open countryside and well spaced large family homes.
467	3	b) The traffic of Tiln Lane will increase significantly, adding to the current congestion, particularly at Carr Hill school and the junction of Moorgate, there will be an increased burden on the Highway Infrastructure, already impacted by the large number of HGVs using Tiln Lane.
467	4	c) The loss of good agricultural land when there are less productive sites still undeveloped.
467	5	d) The general lack of facilities in the town to sustain all these proposed new homes – schools, shops, leisure facilities
467	6	e) Urban sprawl – such sites should only be developed when all other sites within the town boundary have been developed.
467	7	f) Lack of consultation – a notice on a lamp post and a small plan in the local free paper and a short deadline all give the impression of plans being rushed through with little consultation.
468	1	I wish the register my objection to the proposed development of 240 houses adjacent to Badgers Chase (sites 37 and 512 land north of Retford). My objections are based on the following points:
468	2	a) The number of proposed houses will significantly alter the character of the area and detract from it, by creating a pocket of high density in an area of open countryside and well spaced large family homes.
468	3	b) The traffic of Tiln Lane will increase significantly, adding to the current congestion, particularly at Carr Hill school and the junction of Moorgate, there will be an increased burden on the Highway Infrastructure, already impacted by the large number of HGVs using Tiln Lane.
468	4	c) The loss of good agricultural land when there are less productive sites still undeveloped.
468	5	d) The general lack of facilities in the town to sustain all these proposed new homes – schools, shops, leisure facilities
468	6	e) Urban sprawl – such sites should only be developed when all other sites within the town boundary have been developed.
468	7	f) Lack of consultation – a notice on a lamp post and a small plan in the local free paper and a short deadline all give the impression of plans being rushed through with little consultation.
469	1	The whole CHARACTER OF THE AREA will be altered for ever, by this proposed development

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
469	2	The existing HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE will not be able to cope safely with the increase of traffic
469	3	The ever increasing number of HGV VEHICLES USING TILN LANE to avoid the low bridge at Welham will increase congestion in term time and be a safety hazard for the children at CARR HILL SCHOOL
469	4	GOOD CROP PRODUCING AGRICULTURAL LAND will be lost, when there must be poorer land available for housing
469	5	No need build outside the present BOROUGH BOUNDARY as there are plenty of infill sites within the Borough
469	6	A large number of PROPERTIES FOR SALE IN RETFORD that have been unsold for a long time indicates there is not the necessity for any new building
469	7	There seems NO GOOD REASON 10 develop outside the existing development area and spoil the Northern end of Retford
469	8	I strongly object to this proposed Development Framework and sincerely hope my objections are used to stop this unnecessary Building Development
470	1	The whole CHARACTER OF THE AREA will be altered for ever, by this proposed development
470	2	The existing HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE will not be able to cope safely with the increase of traffic
470	3	The ever increasing number of HGV VEHICLES USING TILN LANE to avoid the low bridge at Welham will increase congestion in term time and be a safety hazard for the children at CARR HILL SCHOOL
470	4	GOOD CROP PRODUCING AGRICULTURAL LAND will be lost, when there must be poorer land available for housing
470	5	No need build outside the present BOROUGH BOUNDARY as there are plenty of infill sites within the Borough
470	6	A large number of PROPERTIES FOR SALE IN RETFORD that have been unsold for a long time indicates there is not the necessity for any new building
470	7	There seems NO GOOD REASON 10 develop outside the existing development area and spoil the Northern end of Retford
470	8	I strongly object to this proposed Development Framework and sincerely hope my objections are used to stop this unnecessary Building Development
471	1	I am amazed that there is a proposal to develop this good crop producing agricultural land. I object to the above proposal on the following grounds.
471	2	The Core Strategy was produced before consultation with residents
471	3	Once developed the agricultural land will be lost. I would suggest there must be poorer land available that is suitable for housing development. All Brownfield sites should be developed before developing on the edge of town or outside the borough boundary
471	4	There is bound to be an increase in traffic and the existing Highway Infrastructure will not safely cope with this. During term time at Carr Hill School there is considerable traffic congestion as children enter and leave the school. Additional traffic would be a danger to road users and pedestrians including school children. HGVs already have to use Tiln Lane to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Ever increasing numbers will be inevitable thus adding to the dangers.
471	5	The whole character of the area will be altered forever by this proposed development. The present residential areas are within the borough boundary, fronting on to open countryside and consists of well proportioned large family homes, as are the majority of the houses along Tiln Lane from Welham road This proposal involves building outside the existing development envelope. It is unnecessary as there are plenty of infill sites within the borough
471	6	There seems no good reason to develop outside the existing development envelope and spoil the northern end of Retford with unnecessary housing. The present entrance to the town from Clarbrough, gives a very pleasing impression of well cared for and prosperous town. I trust you will reconsider the proposal to use this good crop producing agricultural land for housing development, and leave it as it is.
472	1	I am amazed that there is a proposal to develop this good crop producing agricultural land. I object to the above proposal on the following grounds.
472	2	The Core Strategy was produced before consultation with residents
472	3	Once developed the agricultural land will be lost. I would suggest there must be poorer land available that is suitable for housing development. All Brownfield sites should be developed before developing on the edge of town or outside the borough boundary
472	4	There is bound to be an increase in traffic and the existing Highway Infrastructure will not safely cope with this. During term time at Carr Hill School there is considerable traffic congestion as children enter and leave the school. Additional traffic would be a danger to road users and pedestrians including school children. HGVs already have to use Tiln Lane to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Ever increasing numbers will be inevitable thus adding to the dangers.
472	5	The whole character of the area will be altered forever by this proposed development. The present residential areas are within the borough boundary, fronting on to open countryside and consists of well proportioned large family homes, as are the majority of the houses along Tiln Lane from Welham road This proposal involves building outside the existing development envelope. It is unnecessary as there are plenty of infill sites within the borough
472	6	There seems no good reason to develop outside the existing development envelope and spoil the northern end of Retford with unnecessary housing. The present entrance to the town from Clarbrough, gives a very pleasing impression of well cared for and prosperous town. I trust you will reconsider the proposal to use this good crop producing agricultural land for housing development, and leave it as it is.
473	1	There has been no consultation with residents
473	2	The whole character of this area will be altered, for the worse, by this development.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
473	3	Agricultural land, that produces good crops, will be lost when surely there is poorer land available elsewhere equally suitable for development
473	4	All brownfield sites within the borough should be developed before any thoughts of building on the edge of town and certainly not beyond the borough boundary on green field sites
473	5	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increase in traffic
473	6	There is an ever increasing number of Heavy Goods Vehicles having to use Tiln Lane to avoid the low bridge at Welham, this combined with additional term time school traffic will bring any movement a Tiln Lane to a standstill.
473	7	An increase in traffic along Tiln Lane, will pose additional hazards to road users and pedestrians alike
473	8	The entrance into Retford from Hayton I Claborough gives a very pleasing impression of the town, indicating a well-cared for and prosperous town. Any development in this area seems unnecessary and detrimental to the town.
473	9	I trust my objections will be taken into account when deciding the future of this area of Retford
474	1	My objections to the proposed development are as follows
474	2	No consultation with any of the residents
474	3	Character of the area will never be the same.
474	4	Good crop producing agricultural land will be lost forever
474	5	Brownfield sites should be developed prior to looking at the edge of town or beyond the borough boundary in open countryside
474	6	The roads in the area will not cope safely with the increase in traffic, specially as Heavy Goods Vehicles are using Tiln Lane to avoid the low bridge at Welham
474	7	Concern with the additional traffic is that there will be an increased danger to road users, school children and pedestrians along Tiln Lane and surrounding area.
474	8	It would seem a planning error to spoil the entrance into Retford from the Claborough I Hayton direction, as at present this gives a very good impression of a well cared for and prosperous town.
474	9	I hope my objections will be taken into consideration when deciding the future of this area of Retford
475	1	I am writing so as to register my objections to the above proposed development. These are based upon the following criteria
475	2	The development, which is outside the borough boundary, would be wholly out of character with the surrounding residential area, which ostensibly comprises well proportioned family homes along the entirety of Tiln Lane
475	3	The immediate residential area is also within the borough boundary and fronts on to open (~ countryside, providing an attractive approach for visitors, and characterising the essence of a well ~cared for and prosperous provincial market town, The development would alter this character, whilst good, fertile, crop producing agricultural land will also be lost, forever
475	4	I would maintain that all "brown field" or "in fill" sites should be further developed within the borough ~prior to even considering those on the edge of the town or outside the borough boundary
475	5	The existing highway infrastructure would not be capable of safely handling the inevitable and , significant increase in the volume of traffic, given that there is already considerable congestion around Carr Hill School and beyond when children are either being delivered or collected
475	6	Vehicles currently park along the entire length of Tiln Lane at these times, whilst also spilling into ~Bigsby Road, Elmwood Close, Richmond Road and Palmer Road, thereby creating substantial difficulties for school buses and moving cars trying to navigate past
475	7	Given the ever increasing number of heavy goods vehicles having to use Tiln Lane so as to avoid !!) the low bridge at Welham, this development would make the residential area even more hazardous for road users and pedestrians alike
475	8	Finally, to my recollection, I do not believe that any formal consultation process with local residents W has taken place prior to the production of the Core Strategy
476	1	I am writing so as to register my objections to the above proposed development. These are based upon the following criteria
476	2	The development, which is outside the borough boundary, would be wholly out of character with the surrounding residential area, which ostensibly comprises well proportioned family homes along the entirety of Tiln Lane

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
476	3	The immediate residential area is also within the borough boundary and fronts on to open (~ countryside, providing an attractive approach for visitors, and characterising the essence of a well ~cared for and prosperous provincial market town, The development would alter this character, whilst good, fertile, crop producing agricultural land will also be lost, forever
476	4	I would maintain that all "brown field" or "in fill" sites should be further developed within the borough ~prior to even considering those on the edge of the town or outside the borough boundary
476	5	The existing highway infrastructure would not be capable of safely handling the inevitable and , significant increase in the volume of traffic, given that there is already considerable congestion around Carr Hill School and beyond when children are either being delivered or collected
476	6	Vehicles currently park along the entire length of Tiln Lane at these times, whilst also spilling into ~Bigsby Road, Elmwood Close, Richmond Road and Palmer Road, thereby creating substantial difficulties for school buses and moving cars trying to navigate past
476	7	Given the ever increasing number of heavy goods vehicles having to use Tiln Lane so as to avoid !!) the low bridge at Welham, this development would make the residential area even more hazardous for road users and pedestrians alike
476	8	Finally, to my recollection, I do not believe that any formal consultation process with local residents W has taken place prior to the production of the Core Strategy
477	1	I am writing to object to the above proposed development in Retford. I object for the following reasons
477	2	The whole character of the area will be altered forever by the proposed development
477	3	The present residential areas are within the borough boundary, fronting on to open countryside and consist of well-proportioned family homes, as are the majority of the houses along Tiln Lane from Welham Road
477	4	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope safely with the inevitable increase in traffic. In term time at Carr Hill School, there is considerable traffic congestion at delivery and collection times as children enter and leave the school
477	5	Good crop producing agricultural land will be lost, when there must be poorer land available that is equally suitable for housing development
477	6	All brownfield sites should be developed prior to developing on the edge of town or outside the Borough boundary
477	7	The additional traffic will increase danger to road users and pedestrians, including school children. You will recall that in November 2008, a child was killed on Tiln Lane. This proposal would mean an increase in traffic on a road which clearly cannot handle any increase safely
477	8	Ever increasing numbers of HGVs will have to use Tiln Lane to avoid the low bridge at Welham
477	9	This proposal involves building outside the existing development envelope. It is unnecessary as there are plenty of infill sites within the Borough
477	10	There has been no consultation with residents prior to the production of the Core Strategy
477	11	There seems no good reason to develop outside the existing development envelope and spoil the northern end of Retford with unnecessary housing. The present entrance to the town from Clarborough, gives a very pleasing impression of well cared for and prosperous town.
478	1	I am writing to object to the above proposed development in Retford. I object for the following reasons
478	2	The whole character of the area will be altered forever by the proposed development
478	3	The present residential areas are within the borough boundary, fronting on to open countryside and consist of well-proportioned family homes, as are the majority of the houses along Tiln Lane from Welham Road
478	4	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope safely with the inevitable increase in traffic. In term time at Carr Hill School, there is considerable traffic congestion at delivery and collection times as children enter and leave the school
478	5	Good crop producing agricultural land will be lost, when there must be poorer land available that is equally suitable for housing development
478	6	All brownfield sites should be developed prior to developing on the edge of town or outside the Borough boundary
478	7	The additional traffic will increase danger to road users and pedestrians, including school children. You will recall that in November 2008, a child was killed on Tiln Lane. This proposal would mean an increase in traffic on a road which clearly cannot handle any increase safely
478	8	Ever increasing numbers of HGVs will have to use Tiln Lane to avoid the low bridge at Welham
478	9	This proposal involves building outside the existing development envelope. It is unnecessary as there are plenty of infill sites within the Borough
478	10	There has been no consultation with residents prior to the production of the Core Strategy
478	11	There seems no good reason to develop outside the existing development envelope and spoil the northern end of Retford with unnecessary housing. The present entrance to the town from Clarborough, gives a very pleasing impression of well cared for and prosperous town.
479	1	I wish to register my objection to the proposed development of 230 houses adjacent to Badgers Chase, Retford (site 37 and 517 on your framework).

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
479	2	Such a development would change the whole character of the area. The present residences are to within the borough boundary fronting on to open countryside and consist of well proportioned large family homes, as are the majority of houses along Tiln Lane.
479	3	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope safely with the inevitable increase of traffic which would come with the development. There is also considerable traffic congestion in term time when children are delivered and collected from Carr Hill school.
479	4	The proposed site is a good crop producing agricultural land and to lose this when there must be poorer land available does not make much sense. All brownfield land sites should be looked at for development before considering developing on the edge of town or outside the borough boundary.
479	5	At the moment the number of HGV lorries using Tiln Lane to avoid the bridge at Welham is increasing all the time and this must be considered an additional traffic danger to road users or pedestrians should the development go ahead.
479	6	There seems no good reason to develop outside the existing development envelope
479	7	There is currently a great deal of house building being carried out in Retford and there are also many empty buildings which are crying out for refurbishment
480	1	I wish to register my objection to the proposed development of 230 houses adjacent to Badgers Chase, Retford (i.e. sites 37 and 517 on your framework)
480	2	Such a development would change the whole character of the area. The present residential area is within the borough boundary fronting on to open countryside and consists of well proportioned family homes, as are the majority of houses along Tiln Lane.
480	3	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope safely with the inevitable increase of traffic which would come with the development. There is already considerable traffic congestion in term time when children are delivered and collected from Carr Hill school.
480	4	The proposed site is good crop producing agricultural land and to lose this when there must be poorer land available does not seem to make much sense. All brownfield sites should be looked at for development before considering developing on the edge of town or outside the Borough Boundary.
480	5	At the moment the number of HGV lorries using Tiln Lane to avoid the bridge at Welham is increasing all the time and this must be considered an additional traffic danger to road users or pedestrians should the development go ahead.
480	6	There seems no good reason develop outside the existing development envelope.
480	7	There is currently a great deal of house building carried out in Retford and there are also many empty building which are crying out for refurbishment,
481	1	I wish to object to the proposal mentioned above for the following reasons. The character of the whole area would be spoilt by a new development. existing properties in the surrounding proposed areas are mostly individually designed and built, some of which are listed buildings e.g. Bolham Hall, Bolham Manor, Bolham Sewage/Tannery buildings and Moorgate Farm.
481	2	The increase in traffic, which is already dense and includes HGVs using the road to avoid the low bridge at Welham.
481	3	The loss of agricultural land which is regularly cropped, coupled with the loss of the wildlife this encompasses.
482	1	Additional traffic congestion and danger to pedestrians on Tiln Lane particularly in the Carr Hill school area. There is already too much heavy traffic on a totally unsuitable road, and these developments would only make matters worse.
482	2	These schemes would involve building outside the borough boundary which is totally unnecessary when there are available brownfield sites that should be developed first.
482	3	Good agricultural land would be lost forever and the entire character of the area would be changed, not for the better.
482	4	There must be some consultation with affected residents before such actions are taken, and I understand this has not happened.
483	1	No consultation with residents of Dunham Grove prior to production of this proposal.
483	2	As you are aware this development will alter the character of the surrounding area.
483	3	Tiln Lane, I cannot think of all the extra traffic that would be using this road, bear in mind it is heavily congested during school hours with cars parked either side of the road also Palment Road,
483	4	How many new and old properties are still for sale in Retford especially leaving Tiln Lane into Retford town centre, also how many young or old people can get mortgages at this time of critical economics.
483	5	No number of houses have been said regarding Dunham Grove
483	6	another point is the school large enough to take extra pupils.
484	1	I object to the above proposed development on fields to the north side of Badgers Chase
484	2	The whole character of the area will be altered for ever by this proposed development
484	3	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope safely with the inevitable increase in traffic
484	4	Good crop producing agricultural land will be lost for ever by this proposed development
485	1	I object to the above proposed development on fields to the north side of Badgers Chase
485	2	The whole character of the area will be altered for ever by this proposed development
485	3	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope safely with the inevitable increase in traffic
485	4	Good crop producing agricultural land will be lost for ever by this proposed development
486	1	I wish to object to the above proposed development of 231 houses on the North of Badgers Chase on the following grounds

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
486	2	The road infrastructure is not able to cope with present traffic safely at peak times and any extra traffic would seriously increase safety issues
486	3	The number of HGVs using the road to avoid the use of the low bridge at Welham, is increasing day by day
486	4	The traffic from Tiln Lane, joining Moorgate already causes a great deal of congestion
486	5	The development would cause the loss of agricultural land something that should be avoided
486	6	The character of the area would be permanently changed The lack of communication that Bassetlaw has had with acceptable
486	7	Green field sites and particularly any outside the "envelope" should not be developed until all brown field sites are used up
486	8	The lack of communication that Bassetlaw has had with residential, until very recently, is not acceptable
486	9	There are already many empty houses in Retford, for various reasons, so why build more?
487	1	I wish to object to the above proposed development of 231 houses on the North of Badgers Chase on the following grounds
487	2	The road infrastructure is not able to cope with present traffic safely at peak times and any extra traffic would seriously increase safety issues
487	3	The number using the road to avoid the use of the low bridge at Welham, is increasing day by day
487	4	The traffic from Tiln Lane, joining Moorgate already causes a great deal of congestion
487	5	The development would cause the loss of agricultural land something that should be avoided
487	6	The character of the area would be permanently changed The lack of communication that Bassetlaw has had with acceptable
487	7	Green field sites and particularly any outside the "envelope" should not be developed until all brown field sites are used up
487	8	The lack of communication that Bassetlaw has had with residential, until very recently, is not acceptable
487	9	There are already many empty houses in Retford, for various reasons, so why build more?
488	1	I am writing to formally register my objections to the proposed 'development' as stated above, the knowledge of which has only recently come to my notice by 'word of mouth' alone. This lack of notice is particularly worrying considering the size of the planned 'development' and the considerable impact it will have on the area. I would have expected a proposal of this nature to be widely publicised and considerable effort made to gather local opinion gathered well before proceeding to the apparent stage this strategy is at now.
488	2	Moving on to the local impact, it appears, judging by the owners quoted alone, that this 'development' will be totally out of character with the present general housing layout in this area. That being of well-proportioned and spaced family properties, with this general character being the norm for the vast majority of the surrounding housing stretching all the way back to Welham Road. This will completely ruin the present well balanced and aesthetically pleasing overall first impression when arriving in Retford by way often Lane.
488	3	Considering the overall placement, it is disappointing to see that the implement station of these plans, regardless of the number or type of housing envisaged, would mean the loss of good crop producing land when there are surely more suitable sites available in the area. I am also led to believe that it is the case that all 'brownfield' sites are developed before sites such as these are considered, which are, after all, outside the existing development envelope.
488	4	Finally, the impact on the highway infrastructure must be discussed. The huge growth in traffic this development' would mean increases the risk of serious accident or incident many fold. I'm sure the initial response would be to point out that there are many HGVs already using Tiln Lane what is the problem? Well the irony is that because of this HGV traffic it is difficult to introduce active physical traffic calming methods. Yet the reality is that HGVs, in my opinion, actually present a much lower risk than ordinary, what I would class 'convenience' driving. HGV drivers are professionally trained and their primary concern from the moment t they climb into their cab is the safety of their vehicle from all aspects, driving, positioning etc. Unlike the 'convenience' drivers, who unfortunately, more often than not, class as their primary concern what is emanating from their stereo or the subject of their mobile telephone conversation. The 'convenience' driver is the type of driver there will be a huge increase of should this 'development' go ahead. Mi.." this with the melee of scurrying children and parents at school times and the risk values become deeply worrying. There has been a child fatality on Too Lane in recent years and whilst not directly involved with school corning's and goings, it merely demonstrates the danger of children around vehicular traffic.
488	5	In conclusion, you will notice that I have put the word 'development' in quotation marks, this is deliberate on my part as it is commonly perceived that a 'development' is a description of an improvement -it is my strong belief that in this case improvement is the last description for such plans as these
489	1	I am writing to categorically object the proposals to develop land for 230 houses adjacent to Badger's Chase, Retford; sites 37 and 512 land North of Retford. r implore you to halt these proposals before the character of our residential area is irreparably altered.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
489	2	The quality of our lives and those of the young families who make up this area is enhanced significantly by the prevalence of open countryside immediately available from the houses, which make a healthy environment for children to grow up in. However, with new developments a vast number of housings would not only obscure but obliterate this surrounding countryside. This would not only decrease the quality of life of the residents, this would also exacerbate the problem of road traffic to a suffocating level, as there are only small width country roads available for access to these areas. The increased traffic levels that correspond with new builds increases danger to the elderly and infants. Indeed, we personally have already experienced a HGV going through our hedge into our garden, a garden kept so lovingly that my husband could easily have been killed as he often works at the very point the lorry came crashing through our hedge. HGVs have to avoid the low Welham Bridge and so are often diverted down Tiln Lane currently, but the number is increasing and so the chance of a similar accident.
489	3	Increased traffic levels would not only bring increased immediate danger, but also a suffocation of the Highway Infrastructure. The aforementioned country roads are not designed to deal with this level of traffic, and Carr Hill School's proximity would make term time drop-off and pick-up times, already severely busy, unmanageably congested, and of course consequentially endanger the pupils significantly
489	4	I am disgusted that we have not been considered as residents in the formulation of this Core Strategy to develop the site. cannot see any need for unnecessary developments at this side of town when there are existing brownfield sites ripe for development, and when this current entrance to Retford from Clarborough is pleasing.
490	1	I would firstly object to this development on the basis of traffic generation and road safety. In the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment produced by Bassetlaw District Council for Retford, and dated September 11th 2009, the following details are noted: "The speed limit on Tiln Lane would need extending. Requires visibility to be provided as standard, on site highway layout to standard, residential travel plan, planning contributions, off site improvements and transport assessment". I have not been able to find these plans and assessments on the website of Bassetlaw District Council, and if they exist I would be grateful if you would provide me with copies or details of where they are available on line. The same document also reads: "There are highway concerns that would need addressing before the site can be considered suitable." According to the SHLAA, if the highway concerns have not been addressed, the site can not be considered suitable.
490	2	As well as the increase in residential/domestic traffic on Tiln Lane caused by the existence of a new housing estate, the development plan of Linden Homes is a ten year plan (as detailed in "BASSETLAW CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (DPD),EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC Inspector's Questions Day 2 -Wednesday 18 May 2011, Main Matter 5"), meaning that there would be construction traffic using Tiln Lane for ten years.
490	3	This is excess traffic on the road, which, in addition to being the scene of a car crash on 20th October 2008 which required the attendance of the fire brigade (as reported in the local Trader & Guardian website) was also the scene of the fatal accident involving a ten year old child on 10th November 2008 (reported in the local Guardian newspaper). Despite these accidents, and despite the SHLAA stating that the speed limit would need extending and transport assessed etc., there have been no permanent improvements to road safety on Tiln Lane. Although a temporary speed detector has been used on Tiln Lane, and despite various reports in the local media from February 2011 advising that Nottinghamshire County Council were "considering" a permanent speed camera, no such improvement has thus far been made
490	4	In addition to additional vehicular traffic on Tiln Lane, the SHLAA makes no consideration of the likely increase in pedestrian and non-motorised vehicular traffic along Bolham Lane and the housing accommodation for the elderly around Water Lane. This area is the natural way to walk or cycle into Retford from many of the houses around Tiln Lane, and is already an area with poor street lighting.
490	5	I would also object to the following statement presented in BASSETLAW CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (DPD),EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC Inspector's Questions Day 2- Wednesday 18 May 2011, Main Matter 5: "For the avoidance of doubt, Linden Homes believe that its landholdings at Tiln Lane, Retford presents good urban extension development opportunity, which has the capacity to deliver up to 200 homes. If This is contrary to and greater than the explicit number of 154 houses stated in Bassetlaw District Councils SHLAA which is rounded upwards from the calculation "Based on 80% of the gross area (6.41ha) at a density of 30 dwellings per hectare."

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
490	6	I would also object to the loss of agricultural land and vegetation. Linden Homes' "Planning and Concept Masterplan Report" dated May 2011 reads: Vegetation 3.6 The site contains no landscape features of intrinsic value apart from the boundary vegetation. This statement contradicts itself by stating that boundary vegetation has intrinsic value, and avoids accepting the fact agricultural land produces vegetation with capital value. Additionally, there are several Tree Preservation Orders extant for Tiln Lane (B42, B125, B139, 8271, B281), so I would question whether there has been a proper assessment of the land to justify this conclusion
490	7	Your SHLAA also concedes that a grade 11 listed building is across the road from the development area, and so I would argue that a housing estate in this area will fundamentally alter the character of the area.
490	8	In BASSETLAW CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (DPD), EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC Inspector's Questions Day 2 -Wednesday 18 May 2011, Main Matter 5, on the basis that there have been delays in [Bassetlaw District Council granting planning approval for various Brown Field Sites in the Retford area (e.g. the Ordsall Hall Comprehensive School), Linden Homes makes the following argument: Therefore Linden Homes does not believe that all permissions will be delivered. Therefore there is a need for more deliverable sites to be brought forward for development to help ensure a rolling 5 year supply. Clearly given the lack of deliverable sites within Retford this means that urban extensions are necessary
490	9	The essence of the argument seems to be that since there are paperwork difficulties with Brown Field sites that are considered suitable for housing, then it is OK to build on virgin ground. Since there are Brown Field sites available for housing, I would on this basis again object to the planning development on Tiln Lane
491	1	To ensure that you are aware that I validate entirely the letter sent by my husband please also accept this letter direct from myself to register as a formal objection for your records
491	2	I write to register my strongest objections to this proposal. I would like to point out that without the information being passed to me by word of mouth from a neighbour I would have had no knowledge of this proposal which I think is an outrageous situation. Given that I live adjacent to the proposed development I would have thought that it would have been necessary to contact me directly. Indeed when a neighbour on the road wanted planning permission for another dwelling on his land the entire street was communicated with, but not it seems when not I but 230 properties are proposed.
491	3	When I bought my property I made explicit checks with BDC in relation to this land and was assured that this Brownfield site would NOT be developed unless and until all other available sites had been exhausted and this is certainly not the case
491	4	This development will damage the whole character of the area which will obviously be altered forever by this proposed development. When I chose this house it was with the surroundings in mind and this character will be damaged for ever.
491	5	The proposed development will open onto a highway infrastructure which will certainly not be able to cope. This section of road is already narrow and immediately is faced with a 90degree bend when travelling out of Retford. Traffic levels are already high and dangerous as we have all the HGV vehicles routed this way to avoid the low bridge when travelling from Retford to Claborough.
491	6	You will no doubt recall that Tiln Lane has already sadly seen a fatality in recent times and this increased traffic will serve in no way to make this road any safer, Indeed as it stands today traffic calming measures are being installed to try to combat the actions in front of Hill School which will be directly impacted by this development.
491	7	This development is going to remove a substantial area of good crop producing agricultural land, when clearly there remains much poorer land that is equally suitable for development. Simply do not understand the rationale of such a proposed development in this location. As said the Character of the area was one of the driving features in my choice to purchase my current property given the fronting countryside and the fact that all the other houses are large executive family homes. My vista from my garden would change from open countryside to a view of a housing estate, and as said I was assured that this site had little to no chance of development every being granted.
491	8	My understanding is that this development will be outside of the current Boundary Borough and I had understood that prior to any development being granted as in this case on the edge of town those other existing sites had to be utilised within the borough.
491	9	I will end the letter as I began to register my strongest objection to this proposed development which will change the character of the area forever, will compromise the highway infrastructure, will increase significantly traffic with all its associated dangers so close to a School, will remove good crop producing agricultural land when many other options exist. I remain very concerned that at no time has BDC contacted me directly re this proposal but hope that this letter now makes you aware that I am now informed and as a result I advise you of my objection
492	1	This letter is written as my objection to the proposed building development adjacent to Badgers Chase, Retford -Sites 37 and 512 (231 houses) and sites 533, 7, 46 and 309 (915 houses) from Tiln Lane through to Welham Road.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
492	2	There has been a lot of house building already completed in Retford over the past 2 -3 years. Much of these new properties are still empty, plus some older properties presumably unaffordable due to the present climate. Therefore, I see no reason for a further 1,146 houses to be built. This large number of new properties would drastically change the character of this area. Where are the jobs for all these people who would move into these areas? I believe there are already a lot of people who are unemployed in the Retford area. Many businesses and shops have closed. This isn't the time for development. How are people and families going to afford these new homes?
492	3	The field behind Badgers Chase and bungalows 79 and 81 on Tiln Lane is good quality crop producing agricultural land -a lot of time and money has been spent on fertilising etc. It is also the home of much wildlife, pheasants, partridges, rabbits, squirrels and various other species of bird life. I know this for a fact because they come into my garden. Is there not lesser quality land that could be used or existing buildings that could be redeveloped? Have all the brown field sites been reviewed?
492	4	The field is much higher than the gardens which would lead to our properties losing their privacy. understand that people are not entitled to a view, but surely we are entitled to keep the countryside.
492	5	Tiln Lane leading to Hayton and Clarborough is already a very busy route despite being a country lane which is narrow in many places and with several bends. It is used every day by heavy goods vehicles and high sided vehicles because they can't get under the railway bridge at Welham. Apart from this a lot of cars use this "country lane" as a shorter run through to Hayton, Clarborough and Gainsborough
492	6	With the existing traffic already using Tiln Lane and with the additional traffic created by Carr Hill School at delivery and collection times during school terms, the road system in this area is just not suitable for any more traffic that would be created by additional housing and would make it much more dangerous during peak times.
492	7	It begs the question as to what will happen with the school if these houses were to be built.
492	8	The whole of the area this side of Retford is farm land, open countryside, areas where parents walk their children and dogs.
492	9	There are some properties on Tiln Lane with high council tax bands and the residents pay large amounts of council tax to live there.
492	10	Retford is an old market town and to go ahead with this development would alter the character forever
493	1	Given that I live adjacent to the proposed development I would have thought that it would have been necessary to contact me directly. Indeed when a neighbour on the road wanted planning permission for another dwelling on his land the entire street was communicated with, but not it seems when not 1 but 230 properties are proposed
493	2	When I bought my property I made explicit checks with BDC in relation to this land and was assured that this Brownfield site would NOT be developed unless and until all other available sites had been exhausted and this is certainly not the case.
493	3	This development will damage the whole character of the area which will obviously be altered forever by this proposed development. When I chose this house it was with the surroundings in mind and this character will be damaged for ever.
493	4	The proposed development will open onto a highway infrastructure which will certainly not be able to cope. This section of road is already narrow and immediately is faced with a 90degree bend when travelling out of Retford. Traffic levels are already high and dangerous as we have all the HGV vehicles routed this way to avoid the low bridge when travelling from Retford to Clarborough.
493	5	You will no doubt recall that Tiln Lane has already sadly seen a fatality in recent times and this increased traffic will serve in no way to make this road any safer, Indeed as it stands today traffic calming measures are being installed to try to combat the actions in front of Carr Hill School which will be directly impacted by this development.
493	6	This development is going to remove a substantial area of good crop producing agricultural land, when clearly there remains much poorer land that is equally suitable for development. I simply do not understand the rational of such a proposed development in this location. As said the Character of the area was one of the driving features in my choice to purchase my current property given the fronting countryside and the fact that all the other houses are large executive family y homes. My vista from my garden would change from open countryside to a view of a housing estate, and as said I was assured that this land had little to no chance of development every being granted.
493	7	My understanding is that this development will be outside of the current Boundary Borough and I had understood that prior to any development being granted as in this case on the edge of town those other existing sites had to be utilised within the borough.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Responde nt	Comme nt	
493	8	I will end the letter as I began to register my strongest objection to this proposed development which will change the character of the area forever, will compromise the highway infrastructure, will increase significantly traffic with all its associated dangers so close to a School, will remove good crop producing agricultural land when many other options exist. I remain very concerned that at no time has BDC contacted me directly re this proposal but hope that this letter now makes you aware that I am now informed and as a result I advise you of my objection
494	1	I am writing to object to a proposed DEVELOPMENT OF 230 HOUSES ADJACENT TO Badgers Chase sites 37 and 512
494	2	I strongly object to this proposal as it will change the character of the area
494	3	It will also increase the traffic in the area and the current highway infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased volume of traffic.
494	4	This will inevitably have an impact on the safety of the children in the area
494	5	The local school would not be able to manage the increased intake of children. The agricultural land will be lost thus ruining the beauty of the area.
495	1	Top of Worksop in the area of the Queen's Buildings: a) with the imminent opening of the cinema it would therefore seem wise to develop associated entertainment facilities close by.
495	2	b) One would hope that the Ship Inn and French Horn would re-open primarily as restaurants.
495	3	c) The vacant Mayfair Centre, fronting the remaining car park would probably offer sufficient opportunities for development as an indoor bowling alley complementing the cinema.
495	4	Development of the land adjacent to Shireoaks Marina: if/when this site is developer, taking into account rural economy and environment, we would prefer to see a group of craft workshops, as at Edwinstowe and Thoresby Hall, with sufficient visitor car parking. This would enhance not only tourism but provide a work place for small businesses outlets and availability to pursue crafts that otherwise may die out.
495	5	Any residential development on this site should preferably be of a quality in keeping with the surroundings, NOT social housing. Therefore this development would not cause nuisance to the environs of the marina and create a more tasteful and quality aspect to the banks of the Chesterfield Canal.
496	1	I do not agree that only enough land should be allocated in Wheatley for 12 houses. More than this number is required.
496	2	I believe we require more like 20-5 as needs are diverse, there is a need for affordable housing. A need for housing for the elderly who want to downsize. A need for young families wanting to move into the village who do not want a large 4 bedroom house. The village needs to attract more families.
496	3	Sites. I do not think that site 239 should be built on. I live in the countryside because I like to see fields and views. I like walking and do not want to see big development visible from the lanes and footpaths where I walk and when I walk through South Wheatley I do not want to see this.
496	4	Therefore I do not think that there should be any development on 236, 237 and 238 which are really outside this village.
496	5	Development on a small scale n site 464 would go unnoticed and would not impact on first one road. It would not block views over the fields.
496	6	Yes here are narrow roads. These are fine for people walking and cars. Lorries can be stopped from using them.
496	7	broadband speeds are low but if more people lived here it would be addressed.
496	8	If more school places are needed it can be expanded. We have a village hall and it is a good one and people use it
496	9	I can see nothing wrong with the play area for children and new ones could be built if there was a need conditional upon development taking place.
496	10	The open spaces need to be left open otherwise open views will be lost. Sites 36/3, 36/6, 36/7, 36/4 must not be built on.
496	11	Room needs to be left for the school to expand.
496	12	The village needs the village hall, sports field, tennis courts, bowling green and children's play area to ensure hat the village remains a living village.
497	1	result in the loss of agricultural land with consequential damage to the environment including the rich insect, bird and animal life resident in the area
497	2	Impact on a site of interest for nature conservation at our local level. We are most surprised that the Nott's Biological Centre and Records Office displayed no objection to any development encroaching on the Idle Valley and its environment
497	3	Generate excessive traffic in an already congested area, particularly along Tiln Lane carrying heavy goods vehicles diverted to avoid the low bridge at Welham. This is already a dangerous conduit particularly at school time with narrow road sections, a dangerous bend at the Bigsby Road/Tiln Lane junction and a horrendous connection with Moorgate. We express surprise that the NCC Highways have not objected to the additional traffic volume which development would attract in this area
497	4	encroach on an area outside the existing development envelope and outside the borough boundary without drawing reference to or priority against the development of brownfield sites in the Borough
497	5	significantly alter the character of this quiet desirable area currently residing on the edge of the town with the increase of traffic and associated dangers of noise, environmental pollution and congestion
497	6	unlikely prove strategically important in the current and projected long term economic climate for UK and Europe
497	7	not significantly achieve a reduction in terraced housing in poor condition which contributes to unattractive environment in the area as reported by Fordham to the Northern Sub Regional Housing Group
497	8	unlikely provide a certain level of affordable housing again as reported by Fordham develop an excess of housing in 2016/17 -some 385 properties forecast by Fordham
497	9	develop an excess of housing in 2016/17 -some 385 properties forecast by Fordham
497	10	We hope you consider the above points as significant issues, sufficient enough to withdraw further Planning Development in the area north of Retford

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
498	1	We understand that consideration is being given to reclassification of the Green Belt land in the above areas to allow development of this area of Retford, namely the building of hundreds of new properties
498	2	Tiln Lane road already cannot cope with the volume of traffic and has an infant/junior school situated on it. Increasing the traffic in this area would lead to congestion and safety issues at a time when we are encouraging families to walk to school. This would have the opposite effect
498	3	There has been no consultation with residents on the reclassification and the development would substantially alter the character of what is currently a leafy suburban area. The lack of consultation is against your own policies. The proposals also involve building outside of the existing development envelope on good agricultural land which is what gives character to the area and the whole town -we are a country Market Town in Retford. The proposals also involve building outside the borough boundary -boundaries are there for a reason and should be observed
498	4	Within the Retford Area there is no shortage of housing and this number of new properties is not needed for the town. Building this estate would put it outside walking distance of the town centre and facilities so encourage further use of the car increasing again traffic problems-why not develop within Retford i.e. the Focus site or where there is a major road to take the traffic i.e. North Road. If everyone sold up and moved into these new builds further from the town centre the centre of town would be damaged and so would the businesses therein causing economic decline at a time when many businesses are fighting to survive. Just look at Gainsborough and Worksop, with developments of new housing sprawling on the outskirts. Outside of Marshalls Yard Gainsborough the town centre is a dump. In Worksop it's the same. Let's learn from that and keep Retford a great place to live not make it the same as Worksop.
498	5	The proposals are fundamentally wrong and therefore should be stopped at this stage
499	1	Whilst not totally opposed to the proposed housing development around the Retford and especially Ordsall areas, we do have concerns over the effect on the town as a whole.
499	2	There are limited access roads into Ordsall -only 1 capable of taking heavy goods vehicles, and this has to pass the primary school. Other routes into Ordsall are restricted by low weight narrow bridges and a minor road accessed by crossing the A1 if coming from the South. Access from Ordsall to town via Hallcroft roundabout can take y, hr. min at school out & rush hour times currently. The road infrastructure will require major improvements to cope with additional traffic trying to get to schools and work During the snow of last year, the outlying main roads were not cleared, never mind the roads into and around the estates and shops. During the floods of 2007, all minor roads into Ordsall over the River Idle, and from the A1 were closed due to flooding, restricting access to the Worksop Road only
499	3	The local Primary school has recently been refurbished and upgraded, but this was done on a budget, and as such not all required works were sanctioned. All too late the upgrades were identified as insufficient with the current capacity of pupils at the school, never mind with an influx of additional populous
499	4	There are no facilities for children in Ordsall -one play park has recently been closed and is now being developed with domestic properties. Those areas left are all clearly sign posted as 'No Ball Games Allowed'
499	5	Ordsall is currently on the edge of the turning circle for flights in and out of Robin Hood and Gamston Airports -some of the proposed developments will now be directly under these flight paths.
499	6	The communications networks in town will need to be greatly improved. In this modern technological age, the web is a must have facility, and currently the system in Retford is already struggling to cope.
499	7	An increase in town could require additional emergency services why then have we had to fight to maintain the existing fire station service, which was to be downgraded -even though the plans for the town expansion were known The town has already lost most of the hospital services it had, and downgrades (removal of maternity services) are being planned for Bassetlaw Hospital. These downgrades in services mean redundancies, and there is insufficient work in the area as it is, without plans to expand the populous. With out the attraction of more employment opportunities in the area, how are you to attract new people to utilise the new properties?
499	8	The plans made available so far for the expansion show some areas as being designated as mixed use areas rather than solely housing -we presume this means domestic and retail / industrial properties to increase the employment opportunities in the area. Current areas of development with this designation have ended up being purely domestic, and a lot of these and older properties around town are still unsold
499	9	Is it the councils intention to take over these properties and through A 1 Housing, give them to the unemployed / homeless / immigrants and increase the burden on those of us who do work and have bought and run our own homes
499	10	There has been an increase in town centre pubs over the last few years, but where are the Restaurants? All we have are Indians and Chinese.
500	1	I am writing to register our opposition to the proposal to develop the brown field land, north of Badgers Chase (off Tiln Lane).
500	2	Our house on Bolham Lane is located at the rear of the field (opposite Tiln Lane). The property is at a lower level than the field, approximately by 15ft-20ft and all that separates our rear house and yard area and the higher field is a single retaining brick wall. I have enclosed photographs to illustrate the area. The difference in height from Bolham Lane and the upper field as you will be aware runs the whole length of Bol ham Lane, but we are the only houses (No's 58, 60, and 62) that are built so close to the embankment, and we are very concerned about the integrity of the embankment if building work begins. Any ground movement here would weaken the retaining wall and could potentially have serious safety issues if breached Our upper floor windows overlook the field, but more relevant would be the loss of light and privacy which would result from any development. Being so close and at a lower level any new dwellings would not only reduce already limited incoming daylight on this side of the house, but it would also create serious privacy issues, with new residents having access or being able to look down from there accommodation into our yard and house area below

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
500	3	We also have serious concerns with respect to the drainage of surface water from any development on this field. This has been a problem in the past, and we fear that the proposed work will increase the risk of surface flooding, and being on this lower level means we are in the natural 'run off' area for any excess water.
500	4	We also object to this proposal on the grounds of access and the congestion that this will also create. We use Tiln Lane frequently, my son walks to and from Carr Hill School, and my partner works there and also walks to the school on a daily basis. Heavy goods vehicles use Tiln Lane to avoid the low bridge at Clarborough, coupled with the usual school traffic, buses etc. all contribute to make this a very busy road. Any development of this area would greatly increase the volume of traffic on Tiln Lane. Not only causing access problems from the surrounding roads and streets, but also and more seriously increasing the potential for accidents to occur
500	5	On a personal note, we find it astonishing that this new development is being considered, given all the new houses built in recent years within the Retford town area, a lot of which are not occupied. Why lose valuable and attractive agricultural land, when resources could be directed at filling or re-developing existing sites within the borough boundary? I hope our objections and concerns have been explained clearly and we would welcome any thoughts or comments you or the developers may care to offer.
501	1	Having looked at the map provided my main concerns are site 37 plus a point of 512. My works was relocated to this address to be away from developments in 1974 following a planning appeal (lost) on my old site. The site he recommended by Mr Peak on behalf of Bassetlaw District Council, at the time was well away from other developments. Why a change of plans? Are the Lockwood descendants pushing for development on site 37?
501	2	For many years there have been "secret" plans for an eastern relief road for Retford. Surely this is needed for the extra capacity that these developments will bring.
501	3	Far better to concentrate on the western side of Retford where most of the development would fit in better (sites 51/R7) due to better infrastructure.
502	1	There has been no previous consultation with residents prior to this proposal
502	2	There has been no previous consultation with residents prior to this proposal. There will be a huge increase in traffic, especially along the Tiln Lane area for schooling
502	3	An increase in children attending the local primary school will result in more congestion and parents parking in places which could cause accidents
502	4	Access for emergency services to the areas would be hazardous
502	5	There are already housing developments where houses remain un-occupied
502	6	The proposed areas are outside of the borough boundary.
502	7	All Brownfield sites should be exhausted for housing before using land surrounding our town
502	8	Retford town's road system already struggles with congestion; this increase in residents will only serve to create more traffic, congestion and pollution
502	9	Retford is a beautiful little market town, it is our worry that if it is developed beyond recognition it is going to lose its character. We are lucky enough to have areas of beautiful countryside right on our doorstep, areas that our children can walk, ride their bicycles, take the family dog for a walk in, if this is taken away where will they go??
502	10	The open spaces on the edge of Retford are a space for nature, whilst walking we as a family have seen many species of bird, butterfly, rabbits, livestock etc. take this away and where will they go??
503	1	I am opposed to the development of 41, 53, 364, 259/R2 (particularly for the housing density) for the following reasons.
503	2	The proposed development of the sites will remove some of the best and most versatile agricultural land from food production. Whilst Bassetlaw may have been given an arbitrary Government target of 600 new housing units for Retford, such short-termism should be moderated by a longer term planning priority for the retention of agricultural land. Quite simply, food security should override any proposals for the removal of top grade agricultural land out of productivity. The UK is already dependent on the importation of 40% of our food requirements. The increase in population to 70 million by 2025 will compound this problem. Globally, all land suitable for crop cultivation is being cultivated. However, productivity is dropping due to soil erosion and exhaustion, climate and environmental change, rising sea levels etc. This together with the pressures of growth in global population, change in dietary habits and (particularly in China, India and Brazil) and political instability make food security a more important and immediate issue than energy security (in as much as problems with energy security can be resolved - we do not, however, have the ability to create more agricultural land).
503	3	The proposed development will impact negatively on the landscape character of the area. The geomorphology of the site offers an immediate visual record of the geological impact of the last ice age. The ridgeline which forms part of the watershed between the Idle and Ryton valleys will be obliterated together with the typical folds of the land on the western edge, which record the successive periods of ice retreat.
503	4	The proposed development of sites will be detrimental to the existing built character of Ordsall as a village settlement distinct from Retford.
503	5	The development would also be significantly detrimental to the existing green infrastructure of the neighbourhood.
503	6	The building of 1200 houses (i.e. 1200 family housing units) upon land west of Ollerton Road, together with further development of land on the east would in essence double the size of Ordsall, destroying what remains of the village identity. Ordsall would, in effect, become part of an ill-defined urban sprawl of the Retford area. The proposed development is too large to be considered as a natural evolution of Ordsall village. This will have a direct impact upon the future sustainability and social cohesiveness of the local community at a time of increasing social, political and environmental pressure. The granting of permission for such a development would, in my opinion, constitute a dereliction of forward planning by the local authority.
503	7	The green infrastructure and current amenity value of the sites would be irrevocably damaged. The sites occupy an area which is crossed by numerous footpaths and rights of way much used by the immediate and adjacent communities. The value of access to open countryside cannot be overestimated. Brecks Road provides a semi natural and historical boundary to development west of its north/south axis. This permits the retention of landscape character whilst providing a corridor for public access which ultimately links Babworth and the Worksop road with Eaton and the River Idle, and the Trent Valley beyond.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
503	8	More importantly, the sites are covered by a network of natural corridors for the transmission of biodiversity. The farmer/owner has already taken advantage of the Government's Set Aside and Stewardship Grant Schemes and has begun reinstating grubbed out hedges, replanting gaps in the remaining hedgerows and latticing the sites with broad strips of unploughed field/margins of land of high biodiversity value. The larger bio reservoirs of Whisker Hills Wood and surrounding copses are thus connected with the greater corridor of the river. All these positive elements for wildlife conservation would be reversed by the proposed development. Whisker Hills Wood would become an ecological island of minimal biodiversity value. The copses would become virtually sterile. The drainage ditch to the west edge of Brick Road would be lost as would its breeding communities of amphibians. It is currently a local hotspot for the common frog breeding cycle. When one considers the population crash of the species through disease and habitat loss, the loss of this breeding site is regionally significant.
503	9	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
503	10	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
503	11	There will be a significant loss of amenity
503	12	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
503	13	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
503	14	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
504	1	No, I don't believe that Retford should be allocated more housing above that already required. It is very noticeable that there are already a lot of empty properties within the site allocations.
504	2	I believe that the sites that would benefit the surrounding area by development in the future would be 10, 70, 71, 342
504	3	None, there are already existing empty units and available space in existing business developments to cater for expansion.
504	4	There are many relevant issues arising from the proposed allocation of sites. The issues that can be considered, as highlighted by yourselves, are all extremely valid, but in some cases those listed as not valid are of greater relevance to the public within close proximity of proposed sites.
504	5	On a wider scale and relevant to all the amenities already in existence within the town would be pushed beyond their limits. This includes emergency services (all considered recently for reduced service), education, healthcare and town centre amenities including parking, road safety and access. It must also be considered that sites 259/R2, 364, 41, 1, 52, 40, 27, 3, 370 and 511 will potentially be beneath the current take off and landing flight paths of Gamston airport and the flight path for Finningley airport. This goes without saying it is an enormous safety issue.
504	6	Every existing open space should be protected with no future development proposals. I strongly believe that everybody should have access to open space within close proximity to their property. Any future development must include open space adequate for all neighbouring properties.
504	7	I am also concerned about the proposed development of agricultural land and the intrusion onto greenfield locations.
504	8	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
504	9	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
504	10	There will be a significant loss of amenity
504	11	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
504	12	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
504	13	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
505	1	Before answering this question the efficacy of the responses to the Questionnaire needs to be considered carefully because too much weight is being attached to the responses received. It was not delivered to each and every household as was intended. Until the Council can be sure that it was delivered to each and every household it should not act upon the responses received at all and should re issue the Questionnaire. If the Council relies on the results of the original Questionnaire the decision to do so risks the Council being involved in expensive litigation because a breach of natural justice will have occurred
505	2	To answer the question -more than 12 new houses are required "and not just two or three bedroom detached and semi detached houses and/or bungalows preferable for market and affordable housing" I have carried out discrete enquiries and from my enquiries a mixed bag of housing is required. Let me start at the bottom and work upwards

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
505	3	<p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>6) There is a need for one, two and three bedroom accommodation but this needs to be broken down into the various needs.</p> <p>a. For younger people who have been brought up in the village and now want to set up home in the village whether in a relationship or not. At the moment such people have to move out of the village to buy cheaper properties in Retford or</p> <p>2</p> <p>Gainsborough because they simply cannot afford to buy within the village. This is unfair and has the potential to permanently deprive the village of young people who are the life blood of any village if it is going to survive as anything other than a place to live for the elderly. Such affordable housing does not have to be provided by Housing Associations which often have the stigma of being cheap and unattractive. We have all surely heard of "shared ownership".</p> <p>As at the 15th January 2012 the cheapest house for sale in North Wheatley according to Right Move was priced at £149,950. In Retford properties were advertised from £29,950 upwards. I think no more needs to be said. Those who have already left the village want to move back -it is quite often the case that couples about to start a family or with a young family want to move to be nearer family members</p> <p>These two groups a. and b. need provision making for them because if we do not attract younger people to the village then the village will die.</p> <p>From my enquiries I know the village has lost a number of young people who have had to move out to be able to purchase a property and has also lost a number of young couples wanting to return to the village either with young children or about to start a family, and wanting to be near their families</p>
505	4	<p>Housing for older people</p> <p>3.</p> <p>There is a group of older people who have lived in the village for many years and have family and friends in the village and want to downsize to something that is cheaper to maintain in terms of energy and general upkeep.</p> <p>So far as older residents are concerned I know of a number who fall into this category and would move if they could afford to but there is nothing available. The cheapest bungalow for sale as at the 1st January 2012 was over £200,000.</p>
505	5	<p>Special housing needs</p> <p>Housing for those who need help with living. There is no provision at all within the village which means such people are forced to move out of North Wheatley</p>
505	6	<p>Extra special needs Sadly North Wheatley is not large enough to support a Care Home for just North Wheatley residents as has been suggested by some. A small Care Home whilst desirable would not be economically viable</p>
505	7	<p>Housing for families needing 3 or 4 bedrooms who want to move back into the village but are not looking for something particularly compact but want something that is economical to maintain in terms of energy and general maintenance. The cheapest four bed roomed house available at 1st January 2012 was £335,000</p>
505	8	<p>Those who have no ties with the village but see North Wheatley as a nice village in which to live and bring up a family and as a convenient place for travelling to and from their nearby place of work. From my discussions I know of at least three people who are so interested but cannot afford to move into the village.</p>
505	9	<p>Those who have substantial means and again see Wheatley as a nice village in which to live and want a house with 4 to 6 bedrooms with some land , I have spoken to two couples who tell me there is no such property in North Wheatley for sale or not on the market which suits their needs. They need land upon which to build. All in all this is a mixed bag</p>
505	10	<p>Those who want no development It has also become apparent to me that quite a number of people want there to be no development whatsoever in the village. By this they mean no change. This cannot be right because the village will quickly stagnate and this has to be wrong and totally unfair to the categories of people who I have set out above</p>
505	11	<p>Overwhelming consensus The overwhelming consensus of opinion is that there should not be high volumes of new housing. A village which is often referred to critically is that of North Leverton which has expanded beyond all recognition in an unsympathetic way to the original village.</p>
505	12	<p>From my enquiries I believe that about 20 to 25 houses will be needed over a period of time but with the facility to increase this number as and when the need arises but this needs to be planned for now.</p>
505	13	<p>Where does development take place As to where such development takes place needs to be considered carefully to ensure that such development does not adversely impact on the village visually and spoil the essential character of the village. Linear extensions have to be looked at cautiously because such extensions can spoil the character of a village because they do not form part of the cohesive structure of the village.</p> <p>One has to ask the question how has North Wheatley developed to what it is today. The answer is that housing development, has always been on a small scale within the village so that such development has become a cohesive part of the village. Even when there has been an 11 house development such as Glebe Close this has not had a huge impact on the village because it is well concealed from the village as was the land which was farmed there prior to the development but it still forms part of the village. The houses built in Glebe Close do not directly front onto an existing street but do so onto a separate road Glebe Close itself so that the impact of the housing development almost goes unnoticed. This is how any further large scale development needs to be planned so that the impact on the village is minimal.</p>

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
505	14	Sites for more than two houses therefore have to be chosen with care to ensure that. Vistas over open fields are not lost to the rest of the village. They do not have an adverse visual impact on the village. That they are discrete and unnoticed so that they blend with the village. Such developments have a village feel about them. That they form part of the village. Building materials in keeping with the original village are used where the colour of such materials will weather in with the existing properties rather than weather out For example red clay bricks rather than concrete are used, clay pantiles rather concrete ones are used. I use these examples because the colour in concrete bricks and tiles leaches out and usually the roofs grow an abundance of moss which has an adverse visual impact
505	15	North Wheatley is a small north Nottinghamshire village. Originally agriculture was the main source of employment but this has gradually diminished over the years. It has now become a convenient place to live for people working in Retford , Doncaster, Gainsborough, Lincoln and of course the Power Stations. There is a large number of people living in the village whose families have lived there for many generations. There is also a large number of people whose families have lived in the village only for one or two generations. It is a village which attracts people to stay once they have moved into it. Originally the village was based around two parallel roads each with a number of names -Top Street, Middlefield Lane, Church Street and Top Pasture Lane at the top and at the bottom Main Street, Low Street and Low Pasture Lane. Between the top and the bottom streets were interconnecting streets -Church Hill, Cambs Lane, Stone Lane and Goachers Lane. There were then three further roads connecting the village to what is now the dual carriageway -the A620. One of these was an extension of Top Street leading across to Wood Lane, the second is Silver Street and then Eastfield formerly Gainsborough Road . The village was relatively compact and self contained having three public houses, a village school, church, chapel, post office, shop, bakers, blacksmiths, tailor's shop, joiner's shop and builders yards and various businesses ancillary to farming.
505	16	Careful consideration needs to be given before allowing planning on some of these sites. The shape of the village is going to change beyond all recognition if large developments are permitted on any of these sites but the impact would be greatest on sites 239 followed by 236, 237, 238 and least on 464
505	17	If any development were permitted on this site other than straight on to Low Street it would be outside the village without any cohesive links to the village and it would obscure forever the open view over fields and the village and beyond from the road just south of the pub. It would be criminal for this view to be obscured forever.
505	18	Any large scale development on this site would create major problems with regard to road access in and out of the site. Low Street is narrow where the land abuts it and similarly the lane just north of the Pub is narrow and not suitable for large volumes of traffic. Certainly not for a connection to the A620. Low Street would need to be widened to allow for footpaths and for entry in and out of the site.
505	19	A small number of houses could be built abutting Low Street without obscuring the view referred to above but Low Street would have to be widened to allow for the building of a footpath and say access in and out of each property
505	20	If 8 properties were built on 236 and 57 properties built on 237 this would create a substantial linear extension of the village along Top Pasture Lane. The substantial blocks of housing would have no cohesive link with the village and would be like a "carbuncle" (as Prince Charles would say) just fastened on to the end of Top Pasture Lane and like a village on its own. It would be very visible from the A620 as it would from South Wheatley and from the Sturton road . This would not be attractive at all. Views over open fields towards Wheatley Wood, Gringley, Gainsborough and Bole would be lost forever.
505	21	Pasture Lane would not be able to cope with the traffic unless it was widened in some way. At the moment there is no scope for widening this road without seizing the front gardens of properties. The junction with Church Street and Eastfield is not capable of coping with a large volume of traffic which would be created by this development. Furthermore Eastfield would have to be widened as would the junction to allow traffic to enter and join Eastfield safely. In the last 30 years 2 houses have been built on Top Pasture Lane extending it to its present length -Whitegates and Orchard Villa on the right hand side.
505	22	If a development of 54 houses took place on this site it would result in another linear extension of the village and then a large block of housing being built on the end of it with no cohesive link to the village and being like a village on its own. This site would be very visible from the A620, very visible from South Wheatley and road leading from South Wheatley to Sturton. Open view vistas over fields towards Sturton and Lincoln would be lost forever. Such a development would be totally out of character with the rest of the village.
505	23	Access to and from the site could be divided between Top Pasture Lane and Low Pasture Lane but neither are wide enough to cope with any increase in traffic and there is little or no scope for widening Low Pasture Lane. The same problems that have been outlined above in relation to sites 236 and 237 would be encountered where Top Pasture Lane joins Church Street and Eastfield. There would be huge problems where Low Pasture Lane joins Church Hill and the road leading from Gainsborough to South Wheatley. It is difficult to envisage how any alterations to the junction could be made.
505	24	This site is capable of accommodating 72 houses but such a large development would not be appropriate. This site could however be developed in a number of ways with very little impact on the village at all and without obscuring views over open countryside.
505	25	This site has the advantage of being capable of development in small phases. At the moment it has two separate viable access ways, one off Top Pasture Lane and one off Eastfield. A third vehicle access could be created directly onto the A620.
505	26	The site would be visible only to three bungalows off Top Pasture Lane and four properties on Eastfield . Unless the whole of the site was developed it would not be visible from the A620 as it is a well screened site.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
505	27	Development on this site could proceed in small phases and the site could be divided into very attractive parcels each accommodating a small number of houses/bungalows. Access to Top Pasture Lane is capable of handling at least five properties. Top Pasture Lane could deal with vehicles from five properties without causing problems at the junction with Church Street and Eastfield. The access onto Eastfield shown on the site plan could accommodate more as and when more properties are required. The junction with the A620 may need widening depending upon the number of houses being developed. If at some stage in the future a need for more houses was identified and the rest of the land was developed up to the 72 house capacity then if the junction into to Eastfield was not adequate a new junction could be opened straight on to the A620 controlled by traffic lights.
505	28	Disruption to the village during development could be kept to the minimum. The owner has indicated a willingness to develop the site so that it could be developed as and when properties were required rather than a large scale development. The site is already well screened by natural hedging and would have little or no impact on the village. This is the only site identified with services connected
505	29	Any development has the potential to benefit the village in terms of amenities
505	30	The local infrastructure concerns are not clear. I am not aware of a potential sewerage/drainage capacity problem
505	31	Narrow roads are not a problem for cars. Lorries can be prevented from using these roads. Broadband speeds could be improved if there were more users and this would be the case if more younger people were to live in the village.
505	32	Extra school places could be made available if a need was shown
505	33	There is already a quite new village hall/community centre. It just needs using
505	34	There is already a well maintained play area for young children and new ones could be provided in larger developments by the developers
505	35	Site 36/2 It is vital that the three open spaces 36/5 36/2 and 36/1 all within the conservation area are preserved to protect views within the village and also act as reminders that North Wheatley was originally a small farming village. Site 36/2 permits open views from Top Street over farmland divided by hedgerows. It is a very precious assets. If this open view is lost now it is lost for ever. The view brings with it the feel that North Wheatley is truly in the middle of the countryside. Unlike many villages hedges are the dominant form of land boundary and it is vital that these are not lost to walls and fences. Hedges provide places for bird life to thrive. North Wheatley has a thriving population of sparrows and small birds which make use of the hedges. It is these hedges which essentially make the village feel so rural.
505	36	The view over the old orchard by Old Mill Farm is a reminder that this was once an orchard of which there were many in North Wheatley -now all but lost
505	37	Site 36/5 This site to the north of Top Street now principally occupied as allotments is a very high site. There are trees for birds to shelter. If this site was lost the birds would lose their habitat The land would have to be reduced in height otherwise any buildings would dominate this entrance to the village
505	38	presently occupied by the school, the village hall, playing fields for football and cricket, tennis courts, a children's play area, a bowling green, a garden and a shelter. No development should take place on any of these sites. Room needs to be left to accommodate any extension that may be required to the school in the future. The village hall is essential for village life. The play area for the children is essential as is the bowling green, the tennis courts and the playing field
505	39	Other open spaces It is not only the open spaces shown on the plan but other open spaces that need to be preserved . Just walk down Top Pasture Lane. Once passed Whitegates the last house on the left, there are huge views over site numbers 236 and 237 over open fields to Wheatley Woods, Gringley, Bole, High House Farm, Gainsborough and beyond. As you continue down the lane and look to your right over site number 238 you can see Lea, Marton, Sturton, Lincoln and back over the village. If this piece of land was to be built on these views would be lost for ever.
505	40	Site 239 If you walk passed the pub and look over site number 239 this is a most glorious vista over fields and the village itself. If this was built on this view would be lost forever
506	1	I would like to start by saying there was no consultation with residents prior to production of the proposals
506	2	The road infrastructure is unsuitable for such a development. Additional traffic will cause more congestion and danger to road users especially at the Moorgate and Tiln lane junction
506	3	It will also cause a danger to pedestrians especially during school hours. This part of Tiln is a nightmare because very large lorries have to use this road to bypass the low bridge. More traffic in this area will be for a serious accident waiting to happen
506	4	This proposal is also building outside the borough boundary
506	5	There are a lot of disused sites around Retford without using agricultural land
506	6	When these houses are built where are the children going to school where are the jobs for the parents to go to in the Retford area
507	1	I wish to lodge my objection to the above development for the following reasons
507	2	Building more properties in an area which is notoriously subjected to flooding
507	3	Increased volume of traffic in an area that has become far too congested already, particularly at the top of Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane
507	4	Changing the ambience of the area
507	5	In 2007 there was major flooding at the bottom of Grove Coach Road/Cavendish Road. New builds would make this problem even worse. Yours faithfully
508	1	location 35 is certainly not suitable for a development of the proposed size.
508	2	Option A
509	1	I think that location 35 is unsuitable and do not support these proposals.
509	2	Protect the area for the proposed development at site 35. Do not destroy the only open space environment at the already large Gateford housing estate.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
509	3	Option A
509	4	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
509	5	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
509	6	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
509	7	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
509	8	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
509	9	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
509	10	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
509	11	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
510	1	Yes
510	2	Option A
510	3	I would not object to an increase. 18 years is a long time.
510	4	164 and 165 would be the preferred sites.
510	5	All should be protected
511	1	North East & West Worksop are already over populated for houses. More employment would be good for Worksop.
511	2	I think location 35 is unsuitable
511	3	Option A
511	4	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35. This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.
511	5	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
511	6	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
511	7	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
511	8	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
511	9	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
511	10	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
511	11	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
511	12	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
512	1	Yes
512	2	Option A
512	3	Yes we agree
512	4	462
512	5	Existing sites
512	6	Together near services
513	1	I agree
513	2	Option A
513	3	I agree
513	4	The 9 dwellings at corner farm should not form any part of the 13 dwellings. These were allocated and agreed a some time ago and should not now be included in any future figures. There should be provision for 13 new dwellings not already allocated.
513	5	453 and 296
513	6	Yes
514	1	I agree
514	2	Option A
514	3	I agree
514	4	The 9 dwellings at corner farm should not form any part of the 13 dwellings. These were allocated and agreed a some time ago and should not now be included in any future figures. There should be provision for 13 new dwellings not already allocated.
514	5	453 and 296
514	6	Yes
515	1	Location 35 is unsuitable as it will cause traffic chaos at the only two places of access into and out of the existing large development
515	2	Option A
516	1	I am happy with the criteria selected
516	2	My slight concern is that the areas selected are based on private sector selection rather than a forward thinking plan to develop Worksop. This may be unfair as this could be covered by the quoted documents. I would find it useful if links to the quoted documents were made available with the consultation document.
516	3	The additional benefits to the town are not clear or sold in the consultation document. The document provided just tells what could be built.
516	4	More job opportunities are essential. I have no view on the towns additional housing requirements a part from concerns regarding the quality of the road network suitability, service provision and impact on utilities and nature.
516	5	I would like site ref 35 to have its woods protected and not used for housing. This area is well used by walkers and the community, not forgetting animals.
516	6	The 700 proposed houses outstrips the local primary schools which have informed the estate residents that their children are not guaranteed places.
516	7	The road infrastructure already has choke points at the entrances and exits to the estate sections and particularly on to Gateford road from Ashes Park Ave. The site would have 2 exit roads to Ashes Park avenue which is not enough. The area only has Ashes Park avenue as an exit to main roads which is not enough. The exit to Gateford road is already very busy at rush hour and further development will increase delays and risks as impatient drivers pull out.
516	8	The shopping area based on the Roman's Inn is very busy, which is a good thing but add site 35 with 700 houses and site 28 with 381 access by car would become difficult. If site 28 added additional retail and leisure services this would be a good thing but I would still be concerned about access across Gateford road from Ashes Park avenue.
516	9	The best sites for additional housing that would not over tax the road network are sites 45,371,151,218, 14, 11, 75, 23, 60.
516	10	I would support all. My priority order would be:
516	11	Site 195 1st choice because of the high mix of employment land and good roads
516	12	Site 153 2nd choice because it will provide much needed recreational space.
516	13	Site 4 option 3 - because of the higher mix of employment land, while still protecting the playing fields. Option 1 would be acceptable with a higher percentage employment land, but I have concerns over the road network to support both land types.
516	14	Site 39 good split of land use
516	15	Site 28 I am concerned over the road network for this area, but if the employment use is being used for local amenities I would support it.
516	16	Yes with the addition of site 35
516	17	Lots of houses but what about additional school places and GP and dentist provision? As thought been given about voice and data speeds. The outskirts of Worksop are already classed as too far from the exchange for the provision of certain high speed internet services.
516	18	Site 35 to be a protected open space.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
516	19	Option A
516	20	I am unaware of the existing sites so do not know what the impact would be of either choice
516	21	I would say together based on the assumption that is more beneficial to the Gypsy and Traveller community.
516	22	No
517	1	I agree that we need to allocate areas for affordable housing but this must be sympathetic existing housing. This also must be supported by additional facilities and industry to support the increase in persons living in the area.
517	2	I do agree Retford requires more employment growth, especially suitable jobs for the young and less talented, as I notice during the day and ever increasing number of youths who should be at work, if the jobs existed.
517	3	I do not want to see more housing that is occupied by individuals being supported by the state.
517	4	7, 46 and 309 areas would benefit Retford as I believe the existing infrastructure is almost capable of supporting this area.
517	5	51, R7, 259 and R2
517	6	As Retford is a small town which can be covered by foot in 45 minutes, I would prefer to keep business and housing areas separate.
517	7	The areas 511, 370 and 3 are sited at bottom of a mini flood plain which drains into the stream at the bottom of Grove Coach Road. When it rains heavily there is already flooding occurring in this area and I fear any additional building or roadways would prevent adequate drainage and create additional flooding for existing residents.
517	8	In addition, Grove Coach road is already congested near London Road and difficult to negotiate a clear route, especially for Fire engines, ambulances , etc.
517	9	Yes, I do believe we should retain open green areas at a similar ratio to existing, as this is one of the pleasures we have living in Retford.
517	10	I can only comment on those areas I already mentioned (511,370 and 3) as these I know well and it would not be reasonable of me to make comments about areas I don't know.
517	11	Option A
517	12	REMOVED
517	13	I believe these should be separate. My reasoning being that someone in transit may see the benefit of a static site and want to make the jump., whereas if it were a mixed site there would be no difference for everyone.
517	14	Regrettably I do not but would be happy to go and look at the suitability.
517	15	Further to me returning the form I have been thinking more about how to best tackle the problem of travellers and the requirement to provide accommodation. In France most towns have a "Camping Municipal" which is where I prefer to stay with my touring van. Often there would be Gypsies staying as well. I see no reason why they should be treated any different to other "travellers" such as myself when visiting a town and so I think Worksop and Retford should create a well advertised Council Camping Site which all visitors can take advantage of and all visitors pay the going rate for a site or pitch. Hope that helps.
518	1	Yes
518	2	Yes
518	3	Before site 35 is approved, consideration should be given to the following - 1. Access to this site should be from a new entrance from Gateford Road, the existing road leading to the site (that is currently blocked off) should be used for emergency access only.
518	4	2. if access is not possible from a new entrance from Gateford Road, the Eddison Park/Carlton Road and Ashes Park Avenue/Gateford Road junction must have some form of traffic controls (traffic lights or roundabout) to avoid even more congestion that is currently experienced.
519	1	Yes
519	2	Option B
519	3	Yes we agree that new housing should be built within the village
519	4	588 and 428 are the best sites for growth
519	5	423 floods
519	6	The open spaces should be protected.
519	7	Existing sites
519	8	Together
519	9	None
520	1	Yes
520	2	Option A
520	3	Yes we agree
520	4	164 and 165 are the most suitable
520	5	All should be protected
520	6	Existing sites in Worksop

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
520	7	Together
521	1	Yes
521	2	No more housing but employment growth for existing population
521	3	I think location 35 is not suitable
521	4	I think the entire site at location 35 should be protected. Further development in this location will result in too higher a density of housing, a significant increase in traffic generation, an increase in road safety issues, a loss of trees, hedgerows, as well as a loss of ecological habitats and landscapes.
521	5	Option B
521	6	Existing sites as further expenditure should be allocated to the existing fixed community.
522	1	No
522	2	All the proposed housing sites are acceptable with the exception of area 35.
522	3	Area 35 is unsuitable because the existing road network is already congested and 700 more houses would make it totally gridlocked at peak times.
522	4	In addition, the local schools (particularly the primary schools) do not have sufficient growth provision to cater for the increased numbers generated by 700 additional houses.
522	5	Finally, I believe there are a lot more suitable brown field sites available which better meet the Governments guidelines - rather than developing on primary agricultural land.
522	6	4 & W9. This would regenerate the east of Worksop - the area of Worksop most in need of local job opportunities.
522	7	Yes - all the protected open spaces should be protected.
522	8	No
522	9	No. Area 35 is unsuitable because the existing road network is already congested and 700 more houses would make it totally gridlocked at peak times.
522	10	In addition, the local schools (particularly the primary schools) do not have sufficient growth provision to cater for the increased numbers generated by 700 additional houses.
522	11	Finally, I believe there are a lot more suitable brown field sites available which better meet the Governments guidelines - rather than developing on primary agricultural land.
522	12	Option A
523	1	GATEFORD AREA 35 - I strongly object to this proposed development
523	2	It will completely ruin the character of this scenic area. We need more open spaces not less
523	3	Why are you considering using Grade 3 agricultural land which is currently being used?
523	4	This would completely spoil the Conservation Area which is adjacent to this land. Destruction of beautiful countryside, detrimental effects on Owday Plantation (site of importance to Nature Conservation) & Whipman woods. Lost bridleway/footpaths hedgerow, walkways which are well used and appreciated by many people daily. There are some very old horse chestnut trees, Hawthorne, wildlife including deer which building on area 35 would ruin and destroy wildlife and habitat for it never to return. Gateford Hill covers a large area of landscape between Gateford Road, Woodsetts Lane, Rough piece/Owday Wood, Dog Kennel Plantation. Any houses built near would ruin the landscape it would mean losing Gateford Hills key views dating back as far as 1800's. Quote from Bassetlaw document "Old Gateford Conversion Area Appraisal": THE OPEN GAPS BETWEEN CONTRIBUTE POSITIVELY TO THE HISTORIC LAYOUT AND PLAN FORM OF THE CHARACTER AREA. PROPOSALS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT ON GAP SITES OR AMENITY SPACES SHOULD ONLY BE SUPPORTED WHERE THEY CAUSE NO DETRIMENTAL HARM TO THE HISTORIC LAYOUT AND PLAN FORM OF THE GATE HILL CHARACTER AREA. If anything is built on this area it will cause detrimental harm.
523	5	The A57 is already congested with constant traffic and anymore vehicles would mean a permanent traffic jam especially mornings and evenings. Traffic coming out of the estate onto the A57 would be severely impacted.
523	6	For Existing homeowners it would mean; Loss of privacy, loss of daylight, light pollution, pollution, risk of flooding. It will overload all local amenities, schools, surgeries and the hospital.
523	7	Option A
524	1	Housing and Business needs to make more use of the brownfield sites that exist all around the area. there is no need to use farm and woodland for housing in this district.
524	2	The addition of extra housing on site on the local area 35 will have a major environmental impact, the area has great natural assets and is enjoyed freely by many people
524	3	The last development at Celtic point resulted in the destruction of an important archaeological site
524	4	Current access to the area is directed down 1 main road and traffic is already a problem more people will result in safety issues and accidents
524	5	Option A
524	6	REMOVED
524	7	Those who choose to live in permanently on sites will use residential pitches these need full facilities those who chose to roam need the basics as it is their choice to live in this way
525	1	No
525	2	Location 35 is unsuitable for the following reasons:
525	3	Traffic generation, access, road safety and parking provision;
525	4	Loss of trees or hedgerows;
525	5	Loss of ecological habitats or landscapes

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
525	6	density and mass of buildings
525	7	Impact on listed buildings and/or Conservation Areas
525	8	Compatibility of the site and its proposed use(s) with existing neighbouring land uses
525	9	Inadequate infrastructure to support the development
525	10	Option A
526	1	No new housing on location 35, does not bring in employment as many commute to cities.
526	2	Would cause increased traffic jams exiting and entering the estate, strain on local schools and services, increased traffic jams and local amenities
526	3	Construction damage to roads and the mess this brings with it
526	4	Destruction of versatile and currently farmed agricultural land, destruction of wildlife habitats, wildflowers, species and general countryside, effects to the local woods, bridleways, hedgerows
526	5	reducing house prices
526	6	I think location 35 is unsuitable due to site already over housed
526	7	Workshop is over housed with limited new employment, site 35 is unsuitable
526	8	Open space on location 35 should be protected, well used by dog walkers, children and families, important for wildlife species and maintaining their habitats
526	9	Could use sites such as Rhodesia where many factories have been closed down, Manton where the hosieries were, unsightly and close to the town centre and a variety of schools, would improve the look on entering Workshop, more affordable for those in most need of housing.
526	10	Option A
526	11	REMOVED
526	12	REMOVED
527	1	Yes
527	2	Option A: Spread between Workshop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
527	3	Yes
527	4	480, 383, 504, 505
527	5	I would support the option of developing Misson Mill site as a mixed use site as indicated (or as a variation of) diagram figure 4, 10.80. This site has relatively good access and would be able to support development.
527	6	I agree with the issues highlighted in 10.75. There is the probability that development of the type indicated in the consultation would have a very positive effect on the village. That is, in bringing more affordable housing to the village, more employment opportunities and also ensuring that the school is sustainable.
527	7	Yes, the open spaces marked 32/1 and 32/2 should be protected from development. In addition the open space use marked on figure 4(multi use map of Misson mill) should be protected. this area has been used previously as a cricket and football pitch.
527	8	Existing sites. Both Gypsies and Travellers and other residents are familiar with the location and circumstances of current sites.
527	9	Sorry, I don't know enough about this to be able to comment.
528	1	Yes
528	2	No. I would prefer the council to re-develop current empty / derelict buildings for homes and businesses.
528	3	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
528	4	Yes....location 35 is currently an open space with woodland, hedgerows and old established trees. Building on this area would destroy the natural habitat of plants and animals.
528	5	I want to object strongly to the building of any sort on site 35. The junction between ashes park avenue and gatefold road is at peak times dangerously busy and increasing houses on the estate will exacerbate the situation.
528	6	Increased noise levels and pollution from cars will reduce the quality of the environment.
528	7	Some of site 35 is usable farming land....with rotated crops
528	8	Celtic point shopping area is now dangerously busy at peak times since ASDA has been allowed to open causing gridlock. More houses would result in more residents using the shops and nursery. There are no pavements through the car park to walk to your car safely. This is so dangerous when picking very young children up from nursery. A very poor design.
528	9	Not all locals from the Gateford estate and surrounding areas get places for their children at our walking distance schools Gateford Park and St John's. This will be made worse by more houses being built.
528	10	Option A
528	11	REMOVED
528	12	REMOVED

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
529	1	1. It is not possible for the Parish Council to decide upon preferred potential development sites as almost all councillors would need to declare a personal interest in one or more sites and in some cases would be required to declare a personal and prejudicial interest in individual sites.
529	2	2. The views expressed from the “future development questionnaires” on the average (mean) number of new houses that could be built in the village up to 2028 was based on only an 8% sample of households (Bassetlaw average 21.27%).
529	3	3. The Parish Council has already confirmed that it has major concerns over the sewerage and drainage capacity and that an increased and fully functional capacity would need to be in place to support any new housing.
529	4	4. The local primary school is now “full” and additional infrastructure and teaching capacity would be needed to support any new housing. Council agreed to pass these comments onto BDC Planning Policy before the 31st January deadline.
530	1	1. It is not possible for the Parish Council to decide upon preferred potential development sites as many councillors would need to declare a personal interest in one or more sites and in some cases would be required to declare a personal and prejudicial interest in individual sites.
530	2	2. The views expressed from the “future development questionnaires” on the average (mean) number of new houses that could be built in the village up to 2028 was based on a 16.82% sample of households (Bassetlaw average 21.27%).
530	3	3. The Parish Council has already confirmed that it has major concerns over the sewerage and drainage capacity and that an increased and fully functional capacity would need to be in place to support any new housing. Council agreed to pass these comments onto BDC Planning Policy before the 31st January deadline.
531	1	Yes
531	2	I am happy for the town to allocate more land to housing and employment growth (especially employment growth) but am not happy for greenfield sites to be used at all when we have so much brownfield land available in and around the town. The greenfield land should be ring fenced until all the brownfield sites are used to their full potential.
531	3	I am strongly against using site 35 for housing.
531	4	The location is on beautiful greenfield land which is constantly used for agricultural production.
531	5	The area is accessed by Public Footpaths and other paths used permissively by local dog walkers, children and families for exercise and recreation.
531	6	The loss of habitat, especially the woods and hedgerows is unthinkable.
531	7	The area is home to many species of birds which are in decline including Yellowhammers.
531	8	. The density of dwellings will overwhelm the already stressed infrastructure, particularly the roads. The exit from the current estate onto Gateford Road is appalling even now. The addition of 700 new homes would bring 1000 more cars or more and the results would be unthinkable.
531	9	On the Ashes Park estate we have no shops, pharmacy or other amenities. The addition of so many new homes would overload the facilities that are closest to the estate and which are already under stress.
531	10	The local primary school is already having to use port-a-cabins as classrooms and will not cope with an huge influx of children.
531	11	I feel strongly the brownfield sites which have been identified should be used first before destroying beautiful fields and woodlands with yet more homes.
531	12	The brownfield sites
531	13	Site 35 should be protected without question as per my above comments.
531	14	Option A
531	15	Yes, it would be ideal to enlarge existing sites
531	16	I would provide the sites with both types of pitch so the community can stay together and support each other and give them the versatility of site they need. It would be ideal for visiting relatives etc.
532	1	yes to a certain degree, there should be more housing available, however to the scale in which the council are planning on is a largely excessive
532	2	yes i do agree with the screening methodology
532	3	700 houses within the gatefold area is rather extreme especially when you look at the issue they already have in this area in regards to traffic in/out of the pre-existing development
532	4	other areas for example Rhodesia, Mansfield road area would provide a more beneficial development site for housing at it would contrude on neighbouring pre-existing developments and it will also enhance these areas with greater accessibility to Mansfield, chesterfield, m1 and a1 which are all beneficial to the community as a whole
532	5	however before we look at more housing we need to look at more employment opportunities in the area. employment is hard to come by and educational services are far from average when looking at other areas within the UK.
532	6	I think it would be more beneficial for shireoaks and Rhodesia areas to obtain more housing as this will reduce the traffic to other areas which is already over crowded for example gatefold estates.
532	7	The best area i think would be better for employment within the community would be best suited near the Wilkinson and B&Q development sites (Manton woodhouse and Retford road areas). however we need to attract nearer the town centre so a development site for employment purposes would best be found near the old ryton park school, or new cinema complex or the waste land near the college (Blyth road).

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
532	8	the sites near the golf course would be beneficial as housing developments with a small area for employment opportunities for example local shops so that there is a wide, diverse prospectus for the area
532	9	also the site near plantation hill area would be beneficial for the top half as housing then i would suggest the lower area to be employment areas
532	10	i would say yes to the gatefold area on the map, as the traffic areas already happening within this area will only get worse especially for a potential development of 700 houses extra
532	11	Also the fact the area is currently been used by the local community, for fitness, and cultural prospects. the wildlife in this area is beneficial too as it provides a diverse landscape in which we should encourage and not destroy
532	12	With a potential development of 700 houses would lower the already low house prices in the area and companies would struggle to sell the amount of housing in the area due to the current recession and low income providers unable to obtain the financial requirements.
532	13	If there is more housing being developed in the Worksop area, then we need to look at educational areas for the young and adult learners, as the college will not be able to provide enough education to the extra population. the primary and secondary schools are already overborne so by enhancing housing in the area, we would also need to look at the pros and cons on educational areas.
532	14	Option A
532	15	together - keeping this pitches together would be beneficial as there is one allocated site and therefore not infringing on other areas.
533	1	It is only when people may be directly involved with proposed building sites that they have to knuckle down and wade through the often confusing literature involved. Finding this form online alone is difficult. Most people simply haven't the energy, time or technology to do it. The council should post a letter to each resident in the areas of concern explaining exactly what may or may not be proposed on the land near their home. The letters should be addressed by name to the residents. Flyers and council newspapers are all very well, but most people, including me simply glance at them and put them to one side or put them straight in the bin. The council should make sure that everyone knows about this and is given a real chance to reply. I didn't know until today that there were public sessions in town on certain days. People simply do not know about this and therefore cannot respond. Also the questions are phrased in such a way that it would be impossible to say 'no' as in theory houses should be built and gypsies need somewhere to camp, but where is a different matter.
533	2	No, the town should remain a small town. There are not enough jobs in Retford for the residents as it is, building more houses is not the answer. There is a lot of affordable housing for sale in Retford at the moment and no-one is buying it. Opposite and next door to me are very nice properties for under £150,000 and no-one has even been to look in a year. Why don't the council help people to buy these properties (housing association style)? If no-one is buying the affordable housing, why do we need more? Where are all these people going to work? The hundreds of extra cars will totally block our streets, Retford simply isn't big enough. It only has one centre, there's no out of town add-on shopping centre, the supermarkets already have full car parks, the schools are full, town centre parking is very limited etc. Building more houses isn't going to encourage employment growth.
533	3	364, 41, 40, 52, 1
533	4	51 & R7
533	5	1. Write to each affected resident personally about proposals to develop land that will affect their properties and lifestyle so that they get a proper chance to respond (see answer to Question 1).
533	6	2. Be transparent about intentions, particularly over land marked as 'opportunity site' - opportunity for what? The sites that concern me directly 24 & 44 are marked as such and when they are not suitable for houses the only other 'opportunity' mentioned is a gypsy site. The residents need telling this personally so that they can discuss their concerns. (See answer to question 122).
533	7	3. Be transparent about numbers, how many people are homeless in Retford at the moment, how many houses are lying empty, how many jobs are in there waiting for people to fill them, how much will the council get from the government to build hundreds of houses?
533	8	4. Find out about the history of the areas marked, who lives there and what has affected them in the past - the 2007 flood victims at areas 24 & 44. (See my answer to question 122).
533	9	5. Look after our small town status, it's something that's good about the town. The town works as it is at the moment, it doesn't need to become a sprawling suburb of Doncaster, Lincoln or Mansfield.
533	10	Yes they should be protected
533	11	No they should remain open spaces
533	12	Option A
533	13	Only in and around existing sites because people are already used to them being there and the gypsies and travellers presumably are ok with these sites. Bringing gypsies and travellers into residential areas is not a good idea for either groups. Gypsies do not wish to live in proximity to townspeople, by their very nature they need rural, open spaces, being in a town would be like living in a zoo. Existing residents have not had the opportunity to consider living next door to a gypsy site before buying their houses, the impact of which would be detrimental both on day to day stresses, property prices and the prospect that they may never be able to sell or even rent out their house.
533	14	Gypsy and travellers should be concentrated on as few sites as possible, transit and residential pitches should be side by side.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
533	15	Areas 24 and 44 have been marked as potential opportunity sites. This is a flood zone and has been deemed unsuitable for housing. My father lives on Blackstope Lane and is still reeling from the effects of the 2007 flood. People were homeless for up to 2 years and the detrimental effects on their health and well being cannot be overstated. My mother never recovered and passed away last year. The council were responsible for not keeping the drainage ditch clear - it was well and truly blocked and therefore when water sank down from the surrounding hills it could not drain away causing a flood. The council have not been taken to court over this negligence and the ditch is now kept clear (on a daily basis) by the retired resident who lives next to it . The flood victims have not had their council tax reduced despite the value of their houses falling to the extent that it would be difficult to sell at all.
533	16	REMOVED
533	17	Quite apart from this the access to Blackstope lane is already a concern especially in winter, there is a bottleneck at Gas House Bridge and cars coming over the bridge cannot see traffic turning into Blackstope Lane because of the steepness of the bridge. In snow or ice conditions the bridge is often impassable. Traffic going into Trent Street to avoid the bridge is also at its limit. The other direction over the level crossing is dangerous and the country lanes could not cope with any more traffic as there are no passing places.
534	1	Location 35: I believe it to be unsuitable for various reasons:- There is already a massive strain on services within the area, especially drainage.
534	2	Traffic, at rush hour, morning and evening, is heavy, and difficult for egress to Gateford Road.
534	3	There would potentially be destruction or damage to Owday and Whipman Woods.
534	4	There is insufficient employment within the area, so this would increase an already congested road network.
534	5	Option A
535	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
535	2	Option A
536	1	In particular I wish to protest about the consideration of the site numbered 35 in the consultation document (near Gateford Hill Nursing Home) which would allow 700 houses to be built on this one site
536	2	I am a concerned citizen who uses this area for walking and enjoying the countryside.
536	3	Bassetlaw Council have given insufficient publicity to the proposed building on this site to allow time for private citizens to explore and put together any evidence. I say in sufficiently because notification in the press has been abysmal and tucked away so that it has been missed by many concerned citizens.
536	4	There has been insufficient time to explore in detail what needs protecting. For example, are there a number of rare and/or protected species of mammal, bird, and butterflies? What effort has the council made to ensure this mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland should be preserved.? If building commenced the rich mosaic of habitats would be lost. What has been found out about the adverse effect on wildlife?
536	5	There would be detrimental effects on Owday & Whipman woods and Owday Plantation (site of importance for Nature Conservation) and a loss of beautiful walkways and bridleways
536	6	There will certainly be a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of the landscape and animals. Many people enjoy walking through this area; children see the animals and the birds are a joy to behold. This area is irreplaceable -something no open space or park could replace -and a very much valued asset. It gives a soft transition from harsh housing development to lovely countryside that is enjoyed by many.
536	7	There will be a loss of agricultural farmland. I am a firm believer that BROWN FIELD SITES SHOULD BE USED BEFORE GREEN FIELD for building. Please don't destroy our beautiful countryside.
536	8	This will lead to too much density of housing in the area. There are already several estates and more building will lead to a degeneration and degradation of the area which already has sufficient housing.
536	9	There will be additional noise and pollution from increased traffic (long term) and from construction whilst building (short term).
536	10	There will be increased danger from traffic. At present we can take our children and grandchildren for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
536	11	Population density will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources -schools, doctors and other services. Electricity, Gas and Water will have to be provided, again leading to destruction of the environment.
536	12	A plea not to let greedy landowners sell this area of outstanding beauty in order to earn a fast buck.
536	13	In conclusion, my preferred option is, do not build on site 35 and use brown field sites instead.
537	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
537	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
537	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
537	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
537	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
537	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
537	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
537	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
537	9	We have a protected Viking Burial ground in the neighbourhood, do you really wish to build more homes around it instead of leaving it in the setting it is, fields, woods etc.
537	10	The traffic effect and further density of buildings in this area are my main reasons for objecting. I have 2 small children I wish to grow up in a safe and environmentally friendly area with fields and woods to go adventuring in. I do not want the upheaval of having to move them from schools and the home they have always known to move somewhere else, which we would. We at Gateford seem to be hard done by when it comes to council amenities, which i personally prefer
537	11	We pay the most council tax in the area and seem to have no say in anything. I am quite happy to carry on pay the high council tax just to get the grassed areas maintained around here if you would just leave the areas is it is.....beautiful!
537	12	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
537	13	I think we have sufficient land for them and it should be kept that way.
537	14	Yes
537	15	Extension of Town Boundary and Urban Sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on Site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick
537	16	Loss of amenity for Children, Residents and Visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
537	17	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users
537	18	Development on this site would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
537	19	Loss of Agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including Wheat and Oilseed rape.
537	20	Access to Shopping Facilities. Our local shops which are sited off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually grid locked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sited closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from Site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town
537	21	Access to healthcare provision is limited, with Doctors and Dentists being sited on the other side of town. Access on foot from Site 35 is impractical
537	22	Provision of Utilities and Services. Development on Site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
538	1	I have recently seen and read about the proposed housing development between Gateford and Carlton. I am writing to you to register my strong opposition to the scheme of converting green open space and beautiful woodland into a vast housing estate. Having recently moved back to Gateford from Chesterfield, the house we bought has views all the way across to Carlton. This is one of the reasons we bought it. Also the woods and open green land provides exceptional walking areas for the local residents, this is something else that would be lost. When Government are pushing us to do more exercise and take more fresh air why is that Bassetlaw deems it right to take away our countryside.
538	2	Already Ashes Park Road and Eddison Park Avenue is a rat run for people going from Carlton Road to Gateford Road and this would be made worse by the large scale development. Havoc would be caused as traffic tries to exit Ashes Park Road onto Gateford as it would similarly at the Carlton Road end of the estates.
538	3	Added to my concerns is the fact that you will be taking away the natural habitat of a vast range of wild life, is this right? I don't think so. If extra housing is required why don't Bassetlaw spend the money on the dilapidated housing seen in many areas of the town. Buy them and refurbish them or knock them down and build where they now stand. Or is this too simple an answer?
538	4	Does Bassetlaw council want Carlton and Gateford just to become 1 big suburb of Worksop? If I'd wanted to live in Carlton I would have bought a house there.
538	5	REMOVED
538	6	REMOVED

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
538	7	I have recently seen and read about the proposed housing development between Gateford and Carlton. I am writing to you to register my strong opposition to the scheme of converting green open space and beautiful woodland into a vast housing estate. Having recently moved back to Gateford from Chesterfield, the house we bought has views all the way across to Carlton. This is one of the reasons we bought it. Also the woods and open green land provides exceptional walking areas for the local residents, this is something else that would be lost. When Government are pushing us to do more exercise and take more fresh air why is that Bassetlaw deems it right to take away our countryside.
538	8	Already Ashes Park Road and Eddison Park Avenue is a rat run for people going from Carlton Road to Gateford Road and this would be made worse by the large scale development. Havoc would be caused as traffic tries to exit Ashes Park Road onto Gateford as it would similarly at the Carlton Road end of the estates
538	9	Added to my concerns is the fact that you will be taking away the natural habitat of a vast range of wild life, is this right? I don't think so. If extra housing is required why don't Bassetlaw spend the money on the dilapidated housing seen in many areas of the town. Buy them and refurbish them or knock them down and build where they now stand. Or is this too simple an answer?
538	10	Does Bassetlaw council want Carlton and Gateford just to become 1 big suburb of Worksop? If I'd wanted to live in Carlton I would have bought a house there. Yours
538	11	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
538	12	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
538	13	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
538	14	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
538	15	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
538	16	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
538	17	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
538	18	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
539	1	LOCATION SITE 35 IS UNSUITABLE FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT -the proposed 700 houses = a poss 1400 extra cars, this area is congested, at peak times you can wait in a line of traffic approx. 50 cars long = 20/30mins to exit ASHES PARK AVENUE onto Gateford road, increased pollution
539	2	More danger to pedestrians
539	3	the schools in this area are at capacity and put further strain on service!
539	4	LOSS of old trees and countryside walks
540	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable and will create overdevelopment of an already well developed site.
540	2	Option A
540	3	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
540	4	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
540	5	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
540	6	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
540	7	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
540	8	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
540	9	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
540	10	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
541	1	We think that location 35 is unsuitable because of the significant increase in traffic this would bring to the estate (especially at the junction with Gateford Road and also the road leading to the primary school) which would increase danger to pedestrians.
541	2	Developing up to the woodland would significantly increase the risk of damage to the woodland and wildlife. It would have a detrimental effect of Owday woods and Whipman woods.
541	3	The loss of a beautiful countryside walk would also be detrimental to the area - this at a time when the government is encouraging people to be active and lead healthier lifestyles.
541	4	It would also be taking up valuable agricultural land.
541	5	Whenever possible open spaces as identified on the map should be protected from any future development proposals.
541	6	For many people location is important when choosing a home. The open spaces, fields and woodland are a very attractive feature of the Gateford estate. The proposal for additional housing at location 35 would be an overdevelopment of the Gateford area.
541	7	Option A
541	8	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
541	9	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
541	10	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
541	11	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
541	12	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
541	13	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
541	14	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
541	15	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
541	16	By providing easier access to the main roads. Reducing pressure on Gateford Road to and from Worksop.
541	17	It would avoid the destruction of an area which is important for local wildlife, for walkers and for recreational use.
541	18	Provide the potential for existing schools to be expanded e.g. in Shireoaks. Whereas this is not possible in Gateford.
542	1	I do not agree with location 35 as this will have an adverse effect on traffic in the area.
542	2	The potential loss of trees and increased pollution would also be detrimental to the area.
542	3	Option A
543	1	Landowners and developers only see the monetary outcome of putting their land up for development generally without thought for the people already living in the area. The local population generally have a better perspective of the suitability of further development because they live day to day in the area and know the shortcomings of where they live and how further development will increase those problems.
543	2	There is already a large number of new build houses that are unoccupied, for sale or let which highlights the fact that maybe there is enough housing in the town at present.
543	3	Employment would be good but all the big employers have left the town e.g. Jenkins, The Rubber Works, Clarks and the Wire Works the remaining employers are small firms in small industrial units. Larger areas of land for larger employers has all but gone (for housing). The bigger businesses such as Wilkinson's have been directed to Worksop as is most of the other business thereby killing off employment in Retford.
543	4	Sites 3 and 310 in particular should not be developed because the area is prone to severe flooding.
543	5	The access is very poor at the junction of London Road and Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road and more transport would only increase this problem.
543	6	It is also my belief that this area has previously been put forward for development and has been denied by the House of Lords.
543	7	Area 511, 458 and 459 also suffer with flooding during heavy and prolonged rainfall and therefore are really suitable for building.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
543	8	Option A
543	9	REMOVED
544	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
544	2	Option A
545	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
545	2	Option A
545	3	Existing sites only to minimise costs.
546	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
546	2	Option A
547	1	I would not want to see location 35 developed.
547	2	Option A
548	1	Yes
548	2	Not enough employment as it is.
548	3	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
548	4	REMOVED
548	5	Option A
548	6	REMOVED
548	7	REMOVED
549	1	No I do not, to find out about the consultation proposals on a sheet of A4 paper fastened to a sign post on the street is unprofessional. Use of the local newspapers in detail and big writing, local radio and acquire one of the empty shops in the town for people to drop in to discuss proposals and see paper copies of the plans. this latter system worked very well when there were proposals to build a 'B' Station at West Burton Power Station.
549	2	I cannot see any reason why more housing is needed in Retford, considering the duration it took to occupy the houses on the old Spices Mill site to name one. Some of these been handed over to such as A1 Housing to fill them. Even new flats that have been built struggle to sell or rent them.
549	3	Industrial development would be a benefit to the town IF they were allocated to location(s) where they would not interrupt with peoples home life.
549	4	See comments in question 1
549	5	51 & R7, 259 & R2
549	6	No site should be a mixed site, my reasons are shown in question 9.
549	7	Plus the amount of times do we here on the news that houses have to be evacuated when a industrial premise catches fire spreading toxic fumes among houses in the local area.
549	8	My immediate Objection to any development is the sites - 24 & 44 (Blackstope Lane) due to the flooding which I experienced twice in eight days in June 2007 with 60cm deep of contaminated water in my property as did most of the street, we were temporarily re housed for seven months due to the damage caused. In 1990 and 2004 many gardens were under flood water.
549	9	I also object to any building in the Bracken Lane area, sites - 3, 370 511, 488 & 489, we get the rain water from this area trying to make its way drains and dykes which cannot already take the capacity water when there as been a few days of rain.
549	10	The sewer drain system in the area cannot cope with any more housing developments, ours and others drains over flow onto the drive and paths together with the contents the drains carry creating health hazards, when this as happened we have had to us the public toilets in town and go our family to have a bath/shower. Why put many more people through this unnecessary traumatic experience ?.
549	11	Yes, apart from the listed areas identified in question 11
549	12	No, with respect to my comments in Question 13.
549	13	This land that as not been developed should be left for the absorption of rain water off the hills etc., and sites - 24 & 44 the derelict site should be demolished and returned to green field sites due to the known flooding problems this includes yourselves!!
549	14	This would also stop the fly tipping, a meeting place for the drug addicts to do their dealing, and vandals and thieves stealing and setting fire to the buildings.
549	15	Option A
549	16	REMOVED
549	17	REMOVED
550	1	The criteria in the Screening Methodology seems adequate for judgments to be made on a location.
550	2	No. The town would require a large increase in services and utility quality to accommodate even the suggested allocation. More than the proposed allocation would be beyond the capacity both financially and sociologically.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
550	3	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
550	4	Not sure.
550	5	Location 4 looks like a promising site. It is sufficiently large enough to have a well planned infrastructure as opposed to piggy-backing an already strained area as many other sites would.
550	6	The area along Ashes Park Avenue (it appears to be labelled as 2/82) should be considered for protection. It is a haven for wildlife, a much used bridle path, and a safe green area for local residents to enjoy.
550	7	The location 35 is to be attached to an already existing housing area. This area already suffers from poor access (especially at peak times) often with long queues to exit only the two routes available out of the estate.
550	8	Poor water pressure in some circumstances and sub par internet speeds (the entire town is serviced by one exchange on the south side of the town. it already struggles to provide the existing population satisfactorily).
550	9	The local primary schools are already over subscribed and would need extra places/facilities or a new school to support an extra 700 houses in the local vicinity.
550	10	Newgate medical centre is already oversubscribed and ANY new development will need to provide increased availability of GP surgeries and the nearest chemist is not within walking distance.
550	11	The already congested road infrastructure in this locale would also be unbearable during construction due to site access. The road surface (which is already bad in poor weather - causing accidents due to slippery conditions) would be dirty and slippery from said traffic.
550	12	Option A
550	13	REMOVED
550	14	REMOVED
550	15	None known.
551	1	I feel there are a lot of areas in Worksop (I believe they are called 'brown areas')that should be built on first and the beautiful open green areas should be left alone
551	2	If we lose these open spaces, Worksop will be even less attractive and people will be less likely to want to move here.
551	3	There is also the dangerous impact it will have on the wildlife that live here.
551	4	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
551	5	As stated above, we have some beautiful areas in Worksop that desperately need to be protected. We are losing them fast and it will be having a negative impact on wildlife, fields/woodlands, historic interests and appeal to attract others to move to the area.
551	6	Option A
551	7	REMOVED
551	8	REMOVED
551	9	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
551	10	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
551	11	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
551	12	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
551	13	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
551	14	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
551	15	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
551	16	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
552	1	Yes, we agree with the criteria.
552	2	Option A

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
552	3	No. More than enough new housing has been undertaken in the last 10 years for the size of the village, much of it since the village survey was completed. We believe that as with above new housing for 6 houses will become available on current fill in sites within the village.
552	4	None but site 101 has had the least new development if any were necessary.
552	5	We do not believe this site should be considered for housing. We objected to the permission for a public house, but having been granted we strongly urge the council not to now change usage for housing. This would potentially destroy an active wildlife and open space for many residents around the field.
552	6	In general, Beckingham is a quiet, residential village with exceptional amenities, not to be spoiled by unneeded development.
552	7	All open sites should be protected.
553	1	REMOVED
553	2	Why not to use some areas marked for employment sites or brown field sites for future housing developments?
553	3	I believe that the town should NOT be allocated more housing in GATEFORD. We have chosen this area, because it is what it is NOW. All my family have spent a lot of money to buy the house here because of the space and views around us. Otherwise we would not have moved here!!! I cannot see any benefits at all, only real trouble - more houses here means more traffic, higher pollution, even less jobs in Worksop, as all those people have to work somewhere. It would be certainly unemployment and crime growth only. We do not want a one more house in Gateford.
553	4	None without the full backing of all the local residents.
553	5	There is no need for additional housing in Gateford area.
553	6	If council properties were not sold on the cheap and retained by the council then people who need them would be accommodated, instead they are run by for profit organisations.
553	7	If further housing is needed use a brown field site.
553	8	Areas that are already being used for commercial purposes.
553	9	None
553	10	All open spaces are important to the well-being of hard working people who surely deserve to be able to go outside and enjoy some fresh air and peace. We want to be able to go for a walk near where we live without the need to use the car to get to the countryside. Gateford has great quality and value because of the existing areas of unspoiled countryside and open space.
553	11	The issue of the increased amount of cars. It is already a struggle to get off the estate in the morning so the prospect of at least another 1000 cars will cause a massive impact on the area - which would become a small town!!!!!! House prices will fall. The local schools are already oversubscribed as is the nearest doctor surgery.
553	12	The land should be left as farmland or woodland.
553	13	Option A
553	14	REMOVED
553	15	REMOVED
553	16	REMOVED
554	1	Yes
554	2	Option A
554	3	Yes and I support the development of affordable housing for younger people.
554	4	428 is the best site in the village.
554	5	Yes the spaces should be protected
554	6	Existing sites
554	7	Together?
554	8	None
555	1	Yes
555	2	Option A
555	3	Yes I agree
555	4	462
555	5	Yes the play area should be protected
556	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
556	2	Option A
557	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
557	2	Option A
558	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable due to increased traffic generation, road safety and parking provisions.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
558	2	I also think potential loss of tree and adverse effect on local woods is unacceptable/
558	3	I think the mass and density of the proposed site is also an issue of concern and
558	4	Gateford already has inadequate infrastructure to support its housing including lack of nursery and school places.
558	5	Option A
559	1	REMOVED
559	2	No, No, No - There has NEVER been any positive benefit from growth in Retford. All you have done is too increase problems - more rubbish, more traffic, more noise, more pollution, etc. Tell me one positive thing that comes from growth????please
559	3	The small sites within the town boundaries.
559	4	You should NOT develop those areas North of Retford near the new nature reserve (51/71/572/R6).
559	5	You should not expand out of Ordsall (41, 53, 364) or into the nice green areas beside towards little Gringley & Grove
559	6	Or near the river Idle (7, 46, 309, 1/178, 1/25, 511, 370,3, 227) or towards Tiln, Bolham or Clarborough. I cannot believe that you even think it acceptable????
559	7	Only the areas within the town boundary & not those listed above. It is unsustainable to keep creating jobs & houses. Try REDUCING houses, employment areas & population, otherwise the planet is doomed.
559	8	There is no consideration made for the wildlife you will remove by your actions. My quality of life has suffered considerably due to the continued expansion of buildings in the area.
559	9	ALL green areas & open spaces should be protected & not just those on your map.
559	10	I would like you make by-laws that you will enforce. When do you stop dogs messing everywhere. Why are dogs never on leads & why are all schoolchildren now afraid of dogs - answer because the owners know they can get away with being bad dog owners.
559	11	Option A
559	12	REMOVED
559	13	REMOVED
559	14	REMOVED
560	1	Site 35 I am against further development in this area.
560	2	Traffic generation, access, road safety and parking provision; the access into and out of the planned development will more than likely be along Ashes Park Avenue, these are already heavily congested at peak/off peak times.
560	3	Loss of trees or hedgerows;
560	4	Loss of ecological habitats or landscapes; - I often walk my dogs in this area and have seen Deer, Grass Snakes, and Badgers in the adjacent woods which I believe would be impacted if this site is developed.
560	5	Design, appearance, layout, density and mass of buildings; - Against if they are built anything like the Celtic Villas development, which appears crowded and feels quite claustrophobic to walk around.
560	6	Impact on listed buildings and/or Conservation Areas; the Blue butterfly is a resident of the neighbouring area to the east.
560	7	Compatibility of the site and its proposed use(s) with existing neighbouring land uses; Inadequate infrastructure to support the development; School? Gateford park and St Johns, already full? local shops (Celtic Villa's already very busy and dangerous to enter /exit due to volume of traffic. no community centre / facilities currently available for residents of the area unless we travel.
560	8	Impact on public visual amenity; it is a very beautiful area at all times of the year...
560	9	Flood risk. possibly if drainage not sorted. The east end of the proposed site does become water logged, in winter / heavy rain.
560	10	We need employment in Worksop first above further housing.
560	11	Option A
561	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
561	2	Option A
562	1	Area 35 This area is not suitable for the proposed amount of housing development
562	2	If housing is to be allowed it must be scaled back, access must not be via Ashes Park Avenue or it's feeder roads
562	3	Due consideration must be given to general amenities and particularly education and child/youth provisions. There is already a lack of facility for the under 18's in Gateford and this must not be worsened.
562	4	The impact on traffic flows must be taken into account as must the impact on local residents in the area of Gateford Park School when parents bring their children to that area by car. There is already a significant problem at start and finish times.
562	5	Celtic Point shops may struggle to cope as on occasions the parking is nearly full.
562	6	One of the pleasures of living in Gateford is the existence of green areas and it is essential that these are not reduced.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
562	7	Option A
563	1	I do not believe that this area is suitable for the proposed amount of housing development.
563	2	If housing is to be allowed it must be scaled back and access must not be via Ashes Park Avenue or it's feeder roads because they are not suitable for heavy traffic especially with the high proportion of children nearby.
563	3	Due consideration must be given to general amenities and particularly education and child/youth provisions because there is already a total lack of facility for the under 18's in Gateford and this situation must not be worsened.
563	4	The impact on traffic flows must be taken into account as must the impact on local residents in the area of Gateford Park School when parents bring their children to that area by car.
563	5	There is already a significant problem at start and finish times. Celtic Point shops may struggle to cope as on occasions the parking is nearly full.
563	6	Option A
564	1	I agree there should always be a screening criteria but looking at my local proposed land (Grove Coach Road) I cannot agree that the screening criteria can be correct when there is such poor infrastructure for education, transport, and drainage in this area.
564	2	No, I disagree because there are already empty houses and not enough jobs to go around. People travel to shop to either Worksop, Doncaster or Meadowhall and I don't see that building more houses within Retford will alter this.
564	3	Housing is not needed in Retford. However, if future developments are required I would prefer to see housing on the edge of Retford towards the Whitehouse's pub, towards Eaton.
564	4	Yes, the website for Bassetlaw Council, including this questionnaire and the view ,aps function related to this questionnaire are wholly substandard. The maps function is not easy to read and will not lead to a global view of issues or concerns as people will neither understand or be patient enough to use it.
564	5	Yes, I believe all open spaces should be protected and a premium cost of developing the infrastructure such as play areas, parks, sports facilities and subsidised shops should be part of any future developments in or around Retford.
564	6	No, as above. Retford already has enough housing, not enough jobs.
564	7	Option B
564	8	Existing sites should be made bigger not spreading the housing.
564	9	Together. This should be allowed on brownfield sites.
564	10	There is currently a Travellers site at Treswell that is inadequate.
565	1	No not at all. The builders are not selling the houses they have just built so why build more? i think the town is pretty well off really i don't feel the need in anymore shops and we have decent supermarkets so i don't see why there would be any thought into more.
565	2	i think number 35 is unsuitable it will increase the volume of traffic and will not be as safe in my opinion the roads are not made for high levels of traffic
565	3	also i think we should consider the wild life that might be harmed and more important the safety of children!
565	4	Option A
566	1	I think that Location 35 is unsuitable for further housing development for the following reasons: Traffic generation, access, road safety and parking provision;
566	2	Loss of trees or hedgerows
566	3	Loss of ecological habitats and landscapes.
566	4	With regard to traffic generation, this area would almost double the size of the current settlement in that area and traffic build up is already an issue due to the limited access to the A57 and A60.
566	5	Option A
566	6	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
566	7	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
566	8	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
566	9	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
566	10	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
566	11	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
566	12	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
566	13	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
567	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
567	2	Option A
568	1	Yes
568	2	Option A
568	3	Yes, we agree
568	4	Site 428
568	5	Site 423 floods
568	6	Site 557 is down an unadopted road
568	7	Yes, they should be protected.
569	1	We think location 35 is unsuitable due to a substantial increase in traffic.
569	2	This would result in an increased danger to pedestrians, especially children as there is a primary school very close.
569	3	This school is already oversubscribed and would not be able to take any more children in, and any children from the proposed site will need to travel by car to alternative schools increasing pollution in the area.
569	4	We as residents were unable to get an NHS place in a Worksop dental surgery therefore where would you propose the new residents of these 700 homes attend a dentist.
569	5	Also it is already hard enough to get a doctors appointment with local surgeries as well, again where would you propose the new residents go for medical help.
569	6	This all goes without saying about the destruction of farming land and loss of beautiful countryside walks & wildlife.
569	7	Option A
569	8	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
569	9	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
569	10	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
569	11	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
569	12	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
569	13	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
569	14	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
569	15	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
570	1	There is nowhere within this questionnaire to raise and outline objections to proposed sites so I will do so Within this section. I object to the proposed site 35 as it is unsuitable for further housing in this area without significant development of there services.
570	2	Access to the Gateford estate is already problematic without further strain through increased traffic.
570	3	REMOVED
570	4	Furthermore, additional housing development significantly threatens the natural environment of nearby woods, fields and walks. I therefore object in the strongest terms to this proposal of site 35.
570	5	Option A
571	1	I feel that site location 35 is not suitable for housing. the increase at this location with connection from the existing transport infrastructure would be unacceptable.
571	2	Not only will this add to the noise levels for the area, substantial delays in accessing in to and out of the Gateford area especially at peak times.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
571	3	The increase in housing will also effect the limited green open spaces that we have
571	4	Option A
572	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable as it will increase traffic flow at the already very busy junction of ashes park road with Gateford Road.
572	2	Option A
573	1	Location 35: To build 700 houses on this site will end up being an enclave Too many people without local proper infrastructure Poor road access just like St Annes
573	2	Option A
574	1	There will always be the need for more housing but can the infrastructure deal with this extra housing.
574	2	Location 35 is unsuitable for this amount of development we have already had electricity supply issues on the existing estates and the school had to be enlarged as it was not large enough for the existing estates.
574	3	There is already a problem with traffic getting off these estates onto the main road an increase would cause real problems
574	4	Brown field sites should be used first before new sites are developed
574	5	Ashes park should be kept as an open green area
574	6	Option A
574	7	REMOVED
575	1	No comment
575	2	I feel that there are enough houses in Worksop. Many houses that go on the market are up for sale for up to 2 years before they are sold. Also there seem to be many houses available for rent that stay empty for a long time.
575	3	I feel that location 35 is not suitable for proposed housing for a number of reasons
575	4	I understand the local primary school is oversubscribed now.
575	5	There are not enough local shops to serve so many more houses.
575	6	The traffic is very heavy at peak times to get from Ashes Park Avenue onto Gateford Road. Also there would be the destruction of woodland and loss of countryside walks.
575	7	Site 4 as this would incorporate all the additional houses required
575	8	Yes
575	9	Option A
575	10	Concentrated around existing sites
576	1	Yes
576	2	Whilst previous town centre development has increased numbers of shops in town centre, an abundance of empty shops in the town is testament to the investment required in the town (attracting businesses & shoppers etc.) before considering developing vast swathes of land to act as commuter belt for Sheffield, which may be of less benefit to Worksop in the long term.
576	3	Location 35 appears to be unsuitable in terms of housing volume proposed given the busy roads already servicing that area, along with destruction of green belt.
576	4	28, 90 & W13
576	5	4, 9 & 39. Areas possess good transport infrastructure, and could be developed without increasing levels of disruption in Worksop.
576	6	Yes, green spaces add to quality of life. Semi rural location adds appeal to Worksop.
576	7	Worksop has a lot of potential (good transport links) housing (comparatively) affordable, countryside location.
576	8	However, to get more money/investment to 'stick' to Bassetlaw, the town centre should be revitalised. The new Cinema may go some way towards addressing this, but at the moment the centre of Worksop is more akin to that of a dying town rather than a growing community.
576	9	Option A
576	10	REMOVED
576	11	Together, to foster sense of community.
577	1	Location 35 is totally unsuitable. The infrastructure is not present or available to support the proposed number of dwellings.
577	2	Option A
578	1	I believe location 35 is unsuitable - further development in this area would put a huge strain on schools and services and traffic.
578	2	Option A
578	3	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
578	4	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
578	5	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
578	6	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
578	7	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
578	8	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
578	9	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
578	10	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
579	1	I would prefer the development of new housing on brown field sites rather than encroachment onto green field sites.
579	2	I have real concerns about further development in the Gateford area, particularly as it does not currently have the infrastructure and services to support this.
579	3	I think location 35 is unsuitable for development of up to 700 new homes. I understand that the current plan is for entrance to be via Churchill Way, significantly increasing traffic exiting and entering the estate, which will also endanger pedestrians. Ashes Park Avenue is already a busy road filtering traffic from the new estates into the busy and dangerous junction with Gateford Road. This particular proposal will put additional strain on local services, including Schools and provide increased pollution.
579	4	I am also concerned about the environmental effects including destruction of farmed agricultural land, detrimental effect on Owday woods, Whipman woods with the potential loss of old trees and the loss of a beautiful countryside walk.
579	5	The area alongside Ashes Park Avenue is an important green space which is used by the local residents. I would be opposed to any further development in this area
579	6	Option A
579	7	I appreciate the local authority has a statutory duty to allocate suitable sites to G&T. My preference would be around existing sites where suitable
579	8	No
580	1	I consider that Location 35 is unsuitable for additional housing. I consider that the countryside around Gateford should not be further developed and that the existing infrastructure and services are insufficient to support an additional development.
580	2	Option A
581	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
581	2	Option A
582	1	Option A.
582	2	No, I disagree that land should be allocated for at least 8 new houses.
582	3	The current development at "Minster View" will represent a significant increase in the village population.
582	4	The infrastructure increase, the post office, shop etc and the viability of the public house is questionable.
582	5	Most of the roads are narrow, especially Low Street and Little Lane and there is already damage to the verges/bank sides due to lorries, trains and cars pulling in to allow traffic to pass!!
582	6	The narrow lanes and fields and open spaces are part of the village character.
582	7	At the worst only 2 houses should be allowed.
582	8	The preferred site is 134 there is better access to the road than the access to Low Street, and the current farm buildings are dilapidated.
582	9	Also site 136 has always been green land.
583	1	Narrowness of the road. Even the bus has difficulty negotiating them. Safety of the school children at peak times.
583	2	The surrounding fields are often standing in water, the drainage dykes are not equipped to take all the extra water that would be generated.
583	3	We have all experienced problems with the sewage system in the past few years
583	4	The narrow roads are only suitable for single traffic
583	5	I would also like to ask would it not make sense to build on existing brown fill sites.
584	1	There has been no consultation on this with local residents
584	2	This development, if it goes ahead, would alter the character of a pleasant existing area.
584	3	The current roads are unsustainable for such a substantial development
584	4	Good agricultural land would be lost
584	5	There would be unacceptable traffic congestion and potential danger to road users, e.g. on Tiln Lane and Bigsby Road

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
584	6	The proposal involves building outside the borough boundary
584	7	It would be better to develop brownfield sites before developing agricultural greenfield land.
585	1	After the present government's extremely vague suggestions and giving their permission to many councils throughout the country to lift the green belt areas; allowing these beautiful areas to be used for the next stage of building programmes leading up to 2028, I would like to add my opinions to the extensive list of those being discussed throughout the area
585	2	Why would the suggestions even come to light in an area such as Retford, beautiful as it is, I'm not ~sure many extra people would be queuing up to be residents in a small market town, which is lacking in any type of light industry or even any extra land for crops
585	3	The rail network seems to be struggling at the present time, with an ever increasing rise in fares and trains are not going straight to the destination without changing. For example: On travelling to Leeds, a change in Doncaster is the only option, unless travelling at inconvenient times, such as early morning. The season ticket prices would be a thorn in the side of most people who would not envisage spending so much of their salary on train travel
585	4	The infrastructure of the extra vehicles having to use the roads, assuming anyone would consider moving to Retford, would be totally unsuitable for the extra amount of contemplated new residents
585	5	In view of the clearance sites of both the Elizabethan High Schools, not even looking as though any Building Construction Team will be interested in any form of housing being put on these two sites, what are the chances of any work ever taking place in the newly suggested area earmarked as prime sites?
585	6	If this plan did ever materialize, would we be able to ask for the re-opening of the local hospital? I don't think so, not in the far distant future. With the whole country having to re-think their lifestyles, I would never be sure that building houses in this area is going to be a good idea; there are not the types of facilities here for the expansion of this rural area
585	7	And finally taking into consideration another aspect: Have you considered the effect on the wildlife? Building on such large amounts of field will simply displace innocent creatures from their homes; animals will be left to roam the area homeless. What have the animals done to deserve such an effect? Furthermore, the displacement could lead to death rates increasing of the creatures. With such chaos occurring in the town; will they ever be able to settle in one habitat again?
585	8	Overall, Retford as a whole is far too small to occupy such a large population; the lack of facilities leave people helpless; the grounds in which are to be built on are completely inappropriate. For an idea as such to take place is beyond me, as well as others across the town. This decision is one of inhumanity, wealth-hungry motivation and complete inconsideration. No prospect can possibly be brought to Retford through this action.
586	1	We feel that the safety of all pedestrian's but particularly children will be put at increased risk especially around Tiln Lane and Carr Hill School. School opening and closing times are particularly congested at the present time and increased traffic can only make this worse
586	2	As Tiln Lane is already congested especially at peak times i.e. weekday mornings, getting access onto Moorgate from Tiln Lane would only be more difficult and dangerous with increased traffic travelling from the proposed development. As the alternative route for high vehicles to Gainsborough the current road structure is not good presently let alone with a higher volume of traffic
586	3	We have had no consultation prior to the proposal
586	4	We also strongly feel that the use of brownfield sites should be developed for housing before developing the edge of town and beyond the borough boundary and the proposed areas involve building outside the existing development envelope, this will lead to the loss of good agricultural land and countryside and do irretrievable damage to the environment
586	5	At present the surrounding area has rural village character yet is close enough to the town centre and building on these proposed areas will alter the character of the area
587	1	We do not agree that the proposed number of new houses is necessary for the Retford area, as may be the case in other areas of the country. There are already a large number of existing houses unsold and no employment prospects because of the loss of industry etc. over the years. Retford is already a dormitory town. It is noted that the plan includes proposals for future employment possibilities but as so much has disappeared from Retford in the form of jobs provision, does there seem to be a likelihood of enough development to provide jobs for all these extra residents or will they be mainly for social housing as seems to be the main allocation at present? With reference to the proposed development to the east of London Road around Bracken Lane and Grove Coach area:
587	2	Traffic is already a problem entering London Road at these junctions and the proposal to add over 600 homes will cause huge problems, especially at school start and leaving times. Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road were never designed to cater for the density of traffic which would inevitably ensue. The sheer number of houses proposed indicates that these new houses will not be in keeping with the surrounding areas.
587	3	Schools in this area are already oversubscribed. Has consideration been given as to where the children from these extra houses will attend school?
587	4	The main area for concern is the increased potential flood risk. The land in question (numbered 3, 370, 511, 488 and 489) is a well known flood plain and absorbs some of the run off from the hills towards Grove. Since previous applications to develop some of this land have been refused on the grounds of flood risk, it seems unreasonable to include these areas in the strategic plan. Several incidences of serious flooding have occurred of which you must be aware, and not only this immediate area will be put at additional risk if the land is developed, the runoff will exacerbate the problems on Grove Lane, Blackstope Lane, Trent Street etc. This has all been pointed out in past applications 1/94/173 and 1/1/95/197. I refer you to all the documentation relating to these, to develop a small portion of what is now proposed. In one previous document, of which I have a copy, the case of 'Rylands v Fletcher' was cited. As a member of your team informed me on the phone that measures could be put in place to address the question of increased flooding, I would suggest that this case makes interesting reading. Has consideration been given to the costs involved in sorting out the flood risk problem? Has any consideration been given to the fact that these well known flood areas if covered with housing and associated paving, roads etc. will increase the potential for problems?

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
587	5	Have Severn Trent and the National Rivers Authority been consulted about these proposals as they must surely be involved before any decision is taken. The present infrastructure is not designed to cope with further development in the area. Will you please make clear what consideration has been given to all these points?
587	6	I have copies of photos of previous flooding and other documentation from the 1995 application to develop the land beyond Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road, which are available should you wish to see these.
587	7	On a final note we would like to express our concern about the way this has been advertised. The proposal to build in 1995 was just before Christmas and again in 2011 we felt pressure to compile our thoughts on the plan just before Christmas and meet a deadline of 6 January (only later extended). many people do not have access to the internet and did not know of the November events, so that time was lost. The only time we have been aware of the proposals in the strategic plan was one article in the Retford Trader at the end of November.
588	1	It is noted that in these sections which deal with gypsies, travellers and travelling show people, no reference is made the latter group with regards to their needs? Is this an omission?
589	1	Following the death of Dion Smith in 2008 outside Carr Hill Primary School on Tiln Lane, I am extremely distressed to think of the increased traffic that the said development will bring and of course the associated risk to lives. The road is already over used with the diversion of tall vehicles from the main road who have to avoid the low bridge at Welham -over 1000 new homes would bring at 1000 new vehicles -an uncomprehend able burden on an already inadequate road
589	2	Current policy guidance advocates regenerating all brown field sites before destroying green areas. A development of this size would have a huge environmental impact, loss of life, trees, as well as light and noise pollution consequences. The planning policy team at Bassetlaw Council should be working hard to stop Retford becoming another urban sprawl by avoiding any development outside the borough boundaries and instead showing compliance with planning best practise and redeveloping and regenerating appropriate brown field sites
590	1	Disagree other than add "infill" - no more estate as "Minster View" is a substantial estate for a village of this size.
590	2	The feedback identified that one of the amenities/attraction unique to Gringley is that it has "open spaces" within the village.
590	3	Plot 135 has always been agricultural land, originally part of the farm now Netburn House and, until present owners, has been used as agricultural land.
590	4	The character of the village is in the small lanes e.g. Low Street which grassy verges. It is unlikely that, with access onto Low Street, the road would be able to accommodate the extra traffic without widening.
591	1	The Photograph (taken on 10/1/2012) shows the culvert on Grove Lane (near to Trent Street) into which ALL of the water from the Grove hills must pass in order to reach the confluence with the River Idle close to Morrison's store. This culvert cannot --and never has --coped with the volume of water that results from heavy snow or rain which causes the iron-barred mouth of the culvert to become blocked with debris. The result is that the surplus water spreads over the areas around Blackstope Lane and the "flood plain" meadows that are now designated for future housing, finally reaching the fields and gardens around Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road. The experience of the floods in June 2007 is sufficient evidence to show the devastation which would be caused if these fields (locally known as "Summer Pasture") were to become hard road surfaces, drives and buildings. What will be done to deal with the "normal" amount of water from the Grove Hills PLUS the extra surface water that will be created from the building development?
591	2	In 1995,when someone submitted an application for development (PAno. 111 /94/173) it was refused because Clause 5 stated:-The site has a history of flooding and its development is likely to expose residents to unacceptable risks and, also, increase the risk of flooding further down stream
591	3	The Phelps report of 1996 stated the planning application "should never have got off the ground
591	4	I trust that the present members of the Planning and Development Council will take note of the wisdom shown in previous decisions and say "NO" to any plans for building in this area
592	1	Traffic generation , especially on Tiln Lane where the traffic at present is at times very heavy due to the school and HGV's.
592	2	Highway safety, i.e. school children and pedestrians on Tiln Lane.
592	3	Road access to the proposed site or sites is unsuitable for the excess traffic this proposal will incur.
592	4	This proposal involves building outside of Retford borough boundary
593	1	There has been no consultation with residents in the area
593	2	At this time there has been no upgrading of the road infrastructure, which at times is already under strain. (Visit the outside of Carr Hill School at the children's start and finishing times). Coaches and Heavy Goods Vehicles cannot flow along Tiln Lane because of parked vehicles, bearing in mind that this road is the route designated for HGV and Double Decked Buses avoiding the Low Bridge at Clarborough. We dread to think of the consequences of allowing the building of 1,130 homes and the resulting increase in traffic on an already overburdened road and the effect that this will inevitably have on Road Safety
593	3	Has or will other infrastructure (schools, hospitals, doctors, shops, sewage, water, electricity and gas supplies etc.; be upgraded?
593	4	Is the proposed site "Green Belt" land? If so, shouldn't our council representatives be protecting and preserving it. We believe that the land is needed for the production of food, i.e. Farming. As a nation we already import too much food with a large carbon footprint.
593	5	Another consideration would be that of access. Residents have invested large amounts of both Time and Money into their properties and areas, and we feel that it would be grossly unfair for them to have an access road into these developments that would cause a huge increase in traffic through their previously quiet cui de sac, thus impacting on residents "quality of life".
593	6	There would seem to be the loss of trees involved in this development, and this has a bearing on both health and the "Quality of Life of residents" It is now a proven fact that trees absorb carbon monoxide and store it, only releasing the poisonous gas into the atmosphere when the tree is chopped down, and of course we have objections on aesthetic grounds to tree removal

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
594	1	In conclusion, we remind councillors that they are elected by their constituents to do the best they can for Retford and it's residents, something that they are aware of, I'm sure. However, please remember that "more" or "bigger" doesn't guarantee BETTER
594	2	As a resident of Park Lane, I am concerned that the development of any or all of these sites will have a considerable adverse effect on the area, especially in terms of access and increased traffic congestion and danger, pressure on local services and potential flood danger
594	3	Access to and from all these sites will inevitably increase pressure on the link roads of Tiln Lane, Longholme Road and Moorgate Hill. At rush hours, vehicles travelling to work, to Carr Hill School and HGVs diverted along Tiln Lane to avoid the low bridge at Welham, will produce long delays, greater risk of accidents, and pollution via noise, exhaust fumes and visual impact. This cannot be a sensible or desirable outcome
594	4	The amount of housing required for future development seems questionable. In the current economic climate, will there really be so much growth in Retford, and where are the jobs coming from? Do we want a stock of empty houses to add to the already high number of unoccupied houses.
594	5	The cost of increasing provision for water and power, drainage, school Places and healthcare will have to be met by someone. Will potential developers be willing to foot the bill? Furthermore, would developers and/or BDC be happy to tackle the flood risk which much of the land is classified as having? The loss of farmland and some SSSI hardly seems environmentally sound, and the overall loss of the visual amenity and access for walkers would be a serious blight on Retford and its future
594	6	The residents of The Drive, overlooking sites 46 and 309, have covenants which prevent building on those fields. Though some of those residents may wish to benefit from developments by forsaking their covenants, I know that many others do not. How is it possible for developments to go ahead with such a split of desire?
594	7	Given the chaotic outcome that development of these northern sites seems to threaten, there do seem to be better options for some development around Retford. The southern sites, e.g. 1, 52 and 41, have access to the A1, and hence the wider road network, whilst avoiding the through-Retford routes
594	8	If greenfield sites do have to be used, then why not jump the immediate boundaries of Retford, avoid urban sprawl, and use rural sites where the opportunity for purpose-built facilities and services would benefit everyone? It is not too late to avoid a potential disaster, but I do fear that going ahead with proposals such as those outlined in sites 7, 46, 309 and 533 would create that disaster.
595	1	I write in respect to your request for views on the proposed housing etc., developments. My comments apply to sites numbered 488, 489, 511 and 370 shown n the Retford map. Firstly, I'm concerned about the level of access to the sites. Both Bracken Lane and Grove Coach road have a street parking throughout its 24 hours, and Grove Coach Road is in fact a barrow bridle path where it runs between sites 370 and 511.
595	2	Secondly, this is a flood risk associated with all the sites. An addiction to build housing on site 511 was refused n 1996 because of fears of flood problems and I doubt that the reedy proposed now by its owner would be any more acceptable then that proposed now.
595	3	Thirdly, building in these sites would lead to the loss of agricultural land, and loss of part of the green belt. It is unlikely to enhance the neighbourhood.
595	4	Finally, judging from previous reactions to previous reactions to build on two of these sites that would be little, if any, community support for any development.
596	1	This proposed development has, to the best of my knowledge been instigated without any consultation with local residents
596	2	The proposed development is totally out of character with the area. The areas in question are green belt land; good agricultural land would be wasted when brownfield sites are available
596	3	The present road infrastructure is tidally unsuitable to support a development of this size. Tiln Lane is already an accident black spot, (with the death of a child). Tiln Lane is also home to a primary school and is designated HGV alternative route. This development would impose additional traffic congestion, danger and safety issues to other road users and pedestrians on Tiln Lane and the surrounding area.
596	4	The proposed development areas are outside the existing development envelope and borough boundary.
597	1	I grew up on Bigsby Road, my parents still live there and as such I still spend a lot of my time there. I feel housing development on this site would not be good for the community and will ruin the character of the area
597	2	On the proposed site at present is some beautiful agricultural land that is home to a large variety of wildlife and trees. Walking the fields in the morning and it is not uncommon to see foxes, birds of prey and even deer. The land also hosts lots of trees, including many old oak and horse chestnut trees that local children (including myself when I was a boy) have gone to for generations to collect conkers in the autumn. In addition to the trees other plant life on the land includes many wild berries and wild flowers that are not only becoming rare themselves but help our country's declining population of bees. The land has many public footpaths and due to its natural beauty it is very popular among walkers from all over Retford and the surrounding areas, with routes regularly published in the Retford Times and books available from the tourist information office to name a few
597	3	Another issue is the road access and traffic generation. Getting on to Tiln Lane from Bigsby Road, Richmond Road and Palmer Road and getting on to Moorgate and Welham Road from Tiln Lane and Longholme Road is already a nightmare at peak times and causes a knock-on effect creating congestion right into and through the town. The added traffic and congestion this site would generate would only make this matter much worse, not to mention the increased danger to pedestrians in what is a primary school area. In closing I ask that you not deprive our community of this much loved piece of land
598	1	I have many worries and they are as follows, I feel that there has been no proper consultation with the residents of these areas, there should be a meeting to enable residents to raise their concerns and a forum to discuss and put forward any views they may have regarding the proposed plans

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
598	2	The roads that service these areas are woefully insufficient to cope with an increased traffic load that the extra housing would inevitably create, particularly at school time which make Tiln Lane/Moorgate Hill and Longholme Road/Welham Road severe bottle necks they are like rat runs, particularly Park Lane where people don't observe the speed limit in their rush to leave school, the road is fraught with dangers
598	3	There is also the added bulk of over height vehicles which add to the congestion which use the Tiln Lane access to avoid the low bridge. The danger to school users and the general public would increase the risk massively and there have already been several serious road accidents/incidents on these roads, which should the traffic load increase anymore then the risk will heighten further
598	4	The character and naturalistic quality of the area will be spoilt as these are very attractive areas with lots of wildlife and rural beauty, we have barn owls, green woodpeckers, cuckoos, reed buntings, skylarks, pipits kingfishers along the canal; and surrounding ditches, water voles and various breeds of bats, also there are lots of beautiful flowers and trees which would be a huge loss to future generations
598	5	The proposed plans would see a further suburban sprawl which would take the boundaries of Retford closer to Tiln Village, Clarborough and Welham which would eat in to the green belt between these areas
598	6	There are lots of areas within Retford that are brown field sites that could be used to generate extra housing should there be a shortage, which due to the numbers of houses currently for sale I doubt there is. Therefore, I cannot see the justification for more extensive building sites that would spoil the beauty and tranquillity of this lovely part of Retford
599	1	Highway Safety as Tiln Lane is already too congested and could not cope with the increased amount of traffic. At peak times this road is often made hazardous by tractors, heavy duty lorries and parents dropping off and picking up from school
599	2	Bigbsy Rd is a narrow by road and is not of sufficient size to accommodate the throughput of traffic that would accompany a development of this size
599	3	The number of road accesses would be increased
599	4	The junction onto Moorgate is already hazardous
599	5	The danger to traffic and pedestrians would be increased
599	6	The danger to the pupils of Carr Hill School would increase.
599	7	The impact on wildlife would be considerable
599	8	There has been no prior consultation
599	9	The length of time for objections is too short.
600	1	Highway Safety as Tiln Lane is already too congested and could not cope with the increased amount of traffic. At peak times this road is often made hazardous by tractors, heavy duty lorries and parents dropping off and picking up from school
600	2	Bigbsy Rd is a narrow by road and is not of sufficient size to accommodate the throughput of traffic that would accompany a development of this size
600	3	The number of road accesses would be increased
600	4	The junction onto Moorgate is already hazardous
600	5	The danger to traffic and pedestrians would be increased
600	6	The danger to the pupils of Carr Hill School would increase.
600	7	The impact on wildlife would be considerable
600	8	There has been no prior consultation
600	9	The length of time for objections is too short.
601	1	Highway Safety as Tiln Lane is already too congested and could not cope with the increased amount of traffic. At peak times this road is often made hazardous by tractors, heavy duty lorries and parents dropping off and picking up from school
601	2	Bigbsy Rd is a narrow by road and is not of sufficient size to accommodate the throughput of traffic that would accompany a development of this size
601	3	The number of road accesses would be increased
601	4	The junction onto Moorgate is already hazardous
601	5	The danger to traffic and pedestrians would be increased
601	6	The danger to the pupils of Carr Hill School would increase.
601	7	The impact on wildlife would be considerable
601	8	There has been no prior consultation
601	9	The length of time for objections is too short.
602	1	The land has NEVER FLOODED since it was bought in 1966. On the contrary the land is regarded as the lowest grade for food production. The soil is dry, free draining (blow-away sand) and as the last tenant Farmer commented, that the field is too small for modern farm machinery
602	2	As far as we know, this land has always been farm land, and there has been no resulting pollution nor contamination
602	3	There are no trees nor protected flora and fauna on this land

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
602	4	The sympathetic development of this site will in no way impinge upon the natural beauty of the area, nor impact upon any wild life Habitat
602	5	Any Service Road for this site would not cause any difficulty when entering the existing highway, as it is wide and straight at this juncture giving drivers good views both ways
602	6	Very few Mattersey homes will be impacted by additional houses on this site
602	7	We accept that the Parish Council and Planners are in a better position than us to know the requirements as far as numbers and types of dwellings. We had envisaged a diplomatic mixture of low cost houses, in order to encourage young families into village and school life
602	8	If children are to be asked to walk to School, thus saving the environment, it is entirely reasonable to expect a footpath as outlined
602	9	The village of Mattersey has not been allocated any affordable houses for at least 45 years, and it is desperately needed -now. As far as we are concerned this land is available immediately
603	1	My objections are mainly on the grounds outlined below. a) The road infrastructure is totally unsuitable for such a large development, traffic restrictions at the bridge on Welham Road mean all heavy vehicles have to use Tiln Lane which at certain times is overloaded and already presents high danger levels. Park Lane and Longholme are already “school ?” and with the expected traffic increase into Welham Road would become a major road. There would also be a chance that the population increase would also involve the number of buses with the demand for increased service into Retford centre.
603	2	b) Surface drainage is also a problem in the area e.g. Park Lane can be like a river at certain times and Welham Road is a constant ?. Therefore the construction of a large quantity of both domestic and commercial/industrial property will probably increase the risk of flooding.
603	3	c) All brownfield sites in the Retford area should be developed for housing before considering the proposed development. Also consideration should be made of the ever increasing loss of retail stores and shops which could also be redeveloped as housing or commercial.
604	1	No development should go ahead until the road under the railway bridge is altered to allow high lorries to proceed to Gainsborough.
604	2	This would make the traffic situation better easing the problem on Tiln Lane. Also the road after Badgers Chase, the road become very narrow with many corners. Also the bridge coming into Claborough is unsatisfactory.
604	3	The entrance on to Tiln Lane near the school becomes a nightmare at school times lorries unable to move.
604	4	Do we need anymore houses? How many are empty in Retford including already built and already planned.
604	5	Is there sufficient work and industry in Retford?
604	6	Are the sewage and drains suitable for more properties or vase alterations to be made to the system?
604	7	All brownfield sites including neglected industrial sites focus for one (for affordable houses)? This would leave land that is already good agricultural use. Further more with the economics crisis would people be able to get mortgages.
605	1	The proposed future development of the Grove Lane, Bracken Lane and Grove Road areas will obviously introduce many problems to this part of the locality and will be if great disadvantage to these living here and are owners of property.
605	2	There is also the problem of increased traffic to and from the area, roads such as Bracken lane, Grove Coach Road and all roads and lanes leading out on to London Road will have to deal with real problems, especially where large vehicles are part of the traffic. At times, today, particularly school times, problems occur due to parking and there is little room for additional traffic.
605	3	More importantly it is well know that rain water flows down from Grove Hill to the land in the Bracken Lane area lying in adjacent fields and flooding the dykes in the vicinity which have not been cleared for some time, and buildings especially residences, suffer considerably.
605	4	My wife and myself agree that the proposed future development should not take place and that the area should remain as it is.
606	1	We would wish to object to the proposal to develop land off Bigsby Road, Retford. There has been no consultation with the local residents.
606	2	The traffic congestion on Tiln Lane (the main access point) is a danger already.
607	1	I would like to object to future development in my area. My objections are: a) Flooding in 2007 when several houses were under water and myself n Grove Coach Road Grove Lane and Blackstope Lane.
607	2	b) Roads cannot cope with cars.
607	3	c) Bracken Lane school with more children.
607	4	We would find it very difficult to farm and carry on in livestock with the roads and cars parked on them with our tractors, cars, lories and other farm vehicles as we use the road every day.
607	5	Houses too near farm as we have a 7,000 pig unit in the next field. I think people would complain about the noise and sometimes the smell.
607	6	The government keep telling us to do more to produce food, how can we when land is being sold for houses?
608	1	I am writing to protest at the proposed housing development on this area. There is already congestion at time in the Tiln Lane area, and this scheme would make it dangerous to pedestrians and road users.
608	2	As there would be more children in the area f these houses were built – where would they attend school? Carr Hill school is already full.
608	3	Brownfield site should be used rather than the edge of the town.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
609	1	1100 houses in Tiln Lane area! How on earth will Tiln Lane cope with the number of vehicles added to the amount of traffic already using this road? Completely unsuitable! Heavy lorries avoiding the low bridge at Clarborough. Twice a day the road comes to a stand still with buses and cars using the school. The T junction with Moorgate is difficult enough now.
610	1	Yes
610	2	Option A
610	3	Yes
610	4	468
610	5	Yes all should be protected.
611	1	We would like to express our strong opposition to the proposed new housing developments surrounding Kilton Forest Golf Course, & between Gateford and Kilton Forest.
611	2	It is our opinion that this should remain 'green open space'. Green space such as this, is a highly valued amenity to the Worksop community, and should NOT be used for housing development.
611	3	We find this proposal outrageous, and intend to do everything within our power to stop it from proceeding any further.
612	1	I am a resident in kilton in Worksop and wish to make my views known that i am strongly opposed to the building of new houses in and around kilton and kilton forest, including the golf course, as i believe that the green land here should be kept as that, for everyone to enjoy.
613	1	The proposed building on sites in this area, numbered 3, 370 and 511, are all low-lying and flood after periods of heavy rain or melting snow, specifically at the beginning of the year. The land is clay and has a high water table. Houses at the end of Grove Coach Road, St Stephen's Road and St Helen's Road have all suffered from flooding. Other areas of Retford have also had flooding and by proposing to build more properties in these areas will only compound the problem. Any such proposals to develop the above three sites would endanger the existing housing estate and will compound and increase the risk of flooding due to the already failing drainage system. The Government and House Insurers have advised against building on land that is liable to flooding.
613	2	The local road infrastructure will also be put under added strain and pressure from the proposed increase in housing on these three sites, which are already currently busy at certain times of the day e.g. school traffic from Bracken Lane Primary.
613	3	There is already house building in progress in various parts of Retford which still have to be sold and a serious lack of jobs in the area.
613	4	Building on these three sites will be very detrimental to the existing estate and I urge the Council to find alternative building sites to those stated at the beginning of the letter, that would be advantageous and an asset to the requirements of Retford in the future.
614	1	Cuckney is an ancient village of less than 300 residents situated in rural North Nottinghamshire. It is built at the confluence of 3 major roads and is a ribbon development along these roads. Historically much of the development in the village has been by the Welbeck Estate and more that 80% of the property is owned by the Welbeck Estate and rented to tenants. There are several privately owned properties spread throughout the village. There is a small village shop, a pub and a primary school. Approximately 2 years ago the Post Office closed. There is very little employment within the village itself and most working residents work in surrounding towns or for the Welbeck Estate. Very little new development has taken place in the village in the last 25 years, but Bassetlaw District Council is now seeking the views of both the Parish Council and local residents regarding possible development in the village. Cuckney Parish Council is very keen to continue development discussions both with Bassetlaw District Council and the major landowner in the village, Welbeck Estates Company Ltd
614	2	It is the opinion of the Parish Council that careful development should be encouraged within Cuckney. The reasons for this position are as follows: A community should be a dynamic place attracting new residents of a cross section of ages
614	3	The community should be able to support the facilities we currently have: the school, shop and pub
614	4	The proportion of rented housing in Cuckney is unusually large and dependant upon a single Landlord. It would be beneficial to increase the proportion of owner occupied housing.
614	5	As the number of people employed by Welbeck Estate decreases there is a higher risk of rented properties being left without tenants. The Parish Council has views about both the type of housing development to be considered and the location of this development.
614	6	Any development should be in keeping with the style of the village
614	7	Developments within the village should be "small" and generally use infill sites rather than completely new areas
614	8	They should attract a cross section of residents, but particularly "first time buyers" and young people
614	9	They should be built using attractive schemes to encourage purchase
614	10	Newly built areas should be mixed in nature, and if several properties are built may include both larger and smaller properties
614	11	Bassetlaw District Council has identified several sites which may be appropriate for development within Cuckney. The original scheme identified 10 possible sites within Cuckney, which have been reduced to three on later consideration.
614	12	Cuckney PC Supports the development of infill areas within the village
614	13	Supports small and sensitive developments within the village
614	14	Does not wish to see isolated large new areas of housing
614	15	Believes that of the 10 areas originally put forward 7 were summarily dismissed for inappropriate reasons and these should be reconsidered in more detail, perhaps including local residents and the Council in this discussion

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
614	16	Believes that the three areas put forward for further development should not be considered in isolation
615	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
615	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
616	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
617	1	I live on Richmond Road and Tiln Lane is already unsuitable for the amount of traffic using it. The heavy goods vehicles have to use this unsuitable route to avoid the bridge at Welham and this already causes problems. The increase in traffic would cause safety issues in the area of Carr Hill School and at the junction of Tiln Lane with Moorgate.
617	2	The population increase would cause problems in relation to school, health and employment. Where will these people work, receive health care, education etc.?
617	3	Building on our green agricultural land when areas are stood derelict and empty is not necessary. Do we need all these extra dwellings in what is a market town? The whole character of the area will be changed and spoilt.
617	4	As far as I am aware there has been no discussion or consultation with the residents of this area.
618	1	Some weeks ago we visited your display on Retford Market Square and examined the plans for future development. We were concerned that among the plots being proposed for possible development was farming land at the bottom of Grove Coach Road.
618	2	A recently as the summer of 2007 properties in this area were flooded and indeed the bottom of Grove Coach Road was inaccessible due to flood water. It would appear that the present infrastructure is not adequate to cope when substantial rain falls. In the 1990s plans for development were initially passed even though the Utility Companies were against the proposals. Common sense eventually prevailed and the development did not proceed.
618	3	At peak times access to London Road can be difficult from Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road and additional building would only exacerbate the problem. Bracken Lane is particularly busy when children are being dropped at school and collected.
618	4	Whilst we appreciate the Government's plans for new housing and the reasons, it does seem obvious the this particular area should be left as it is.
619	1	Having lived in Bigaby Road and St Saviours Close for over 40 year, I have seen the build up of traffic and deterioration of traffic flow on Tiln Lane.
619	2	Deterioration of the Character of the area
619	3	Dangerous build up of traffic conditions and threat of life
619	4	Schools safety. The Tiln Lane/Welham Road junction already presents considerable problems where accidents have occurred.
619	5	Does the council have a proposed target for the number of acceptable accidents/deaths that might occur if there plans are carried through.
620	1	Site allocations including the fields either side of Bracken Lane and fields backing onto Rutland Road and Cavendish Road.
620	2	We are against any development in this area because the only access is via Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane, and an increase of traffic along these roads would cause a lot of disruption and danger to the inhabitants.
620	3	The school is already full and its playing field often flooded
620	4	The infrastructure could not sustain more building as there are already problems with flooding in some parts. This could be made much worse if the land were developed.
621	1	14 new houses is approximately 1 house per year of the plan. I would suggest that this is totally inadequate for the 5th/6th largest village in Bassetlaw. I would have thought 50+ would be more appropriate, bearing in mind we have no limitations I believe, on sewerage, primary school places etc.
621	2	The only way the village will obtain a village hall, which the residents have identified as desirable, is taking from a significant housing development.
621	3	No preference but you should note site 516 received planning permission for an additional house in in July 2011
622	1	Our major concern is that at present the surrounding road system is totally unsuitable for any further development. Currently, Tiln Lane and Smeath Road are carrying too many high-sided commercial vehicles due to the diversion away from the low bridge on the A620. Any increase in traffic would increase the danger to road users and pedestrians.
622	2	If pupil numbers are to be increased at Carr Hill School due to the new development, then this would increase the current traffic problems associated with the arrival and departure of pupils. Unfortunately Cornwall Road is now being used for both school buses and public transport for which it was not designed. It is too narrow. Any additional traffic at these 'peak' times would cause very serious problems.
622	3	With the increasing requirement for the production of home-produced food in the U.K., we are against the development of good agricultural land for housing development. Priority should always be given to the development of 'brownfield' sites before moving onto 'greenfield' sites.
622	4	There is no doubt that a development the size of the one proposed would appreciably alter the character of the area. We moved to our current house in 1987 because it was on the edge of town with easy access to the local walks to the north and north-east of town. These would be destroyed by such a development.
623	1	There has been little or no consultation with the residents prior to the introduction of this proposal. All information has been by word of mouth and disinformation has been rife. The council has made very little effort to ensure the facts of this development have been made known to the residents.
623	2	The proposal for the area North of Bigsby Road is for 900 houses. An estate the size of Hallcroft would be crammed into an area less than half the size. To get this number of dwellings on this footprint would seriously alter the character of the area. We are all aware of the style of housing used by developers particularly in the Albert Road and Thrumpton Lane estates with buildings squashed together and no thought given to the style of the housing.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
623	3	Traffic along Tiln and Moorgate is chaotic at peak times during the day as it is. Cars are mixing with heavy goods passing in front of Carr Hill school. At several times during the day parents are dropping and collecting children from school. This brings serious concerns about the safety of children travelling along Tiln Lane and surrounding areas.
623	4	This would mean a loss of a valuable open space which has become a haven for wildlife with fox, hare, many species of birds, including owls. Even deer and snake have been seen here. This is an area enjoyed by many walkers and people who walk the public footpaths that cross the fields.
623	5	There would be a loss of several hundred metres of established hedges, trees and ditches which would never be replaced.
623	6	Replacing what is now fields with housing would seriously reduce the natural drainage and risk flooding.
623	7	The ditches form part of the feeder system which collect water for the canal.
623	8	There are already several existing brown field sites at the former Elizabethan Upper and Lower sites as well as the King Edward site. These should be chosen before greenfield sites.
623	9	The council has always promoted Retford as a small market town. Surely this proposal will alter the whole character of the town which is becoming a dormitory for people working in Sheffield, Doncaster and Lincoln.
623	10	It's doubtful that the existing services will be sufficient to support the increase in sewerage and water.
623	11	With the additional influx of people into the area this will put a burden on the facilities available in the town. Where will the extra doctors, dentists and school places come from.
624	1	We agree in principle
624	2	Sites on the outskirts of the village i.e. 101, 451, 496, 497
624	3	We were in favour of both applications for a public house, we understand that there may be a reapplication for the original site which would be a more suitable site. If the original site is accepted then site 106 should be considered for housing
624	4	A larger village shop could be beneficial
624	5	The open spaces identified on the map should be protected from any future development.
625	1	There has been little or no consultation with the residents prior to the introduction of the proposal. All information has been by word of mouth and disinformation has been rife. The council has made very little effort to ensure the facts of this development have been made known to the residents
625	2	The proposal for the area North of Bigsby Road is for 900 houses. An estate the size of Hallcroft would be crammed into an area less than half the size. To get this number of dwellings on this footprint would seriously alter the character of the area. We are all aware of the style of housing used by developers particularly in the Albert Road and Thrumpton Lane estates with buildings squashed together and no thought given to the style of the housing.
625	3	Traffic along Tiln and Moorgate is chaotic at peak times during the day as it is. Cars are mixing with heavy goods passing in front of Carr Hill school. At several times during the day parents are dropping and collecting children from school. This brings serious concerns about the safety of children travelling along Tiln Lane and surrounding areas.
625	4	This would mean a loss of a valuable open space which has become a haven for wildlife with fox, hare, many species of birds, including owls. Even deer and snake have been seen here. This is an area enjoyed by many walkers and people who walk the public footpaths that cross the fields.
625	5	There would be a loss of several hundred metres of established hedges, trees and ditches which would never be replaced.
625	6	Replacing what is now fields with housing would seriously reduce the natural drainage and risk flooding.
625	7	The ditches form part of the feeder system which collect water for the canal.
625	8	There are already several existing brown field sites at the former Elizabethan Upper and Lower sites as well as the King Edward site. These should be chosen before greenfield sites.
625	9	The council has always promoted Retford as a small market town. Surely this proposal will alter the whole character of the town which is becoming a dormitory for people working in Sheffield, Doncaster and Lincoln.
625	10	It's doubtful that the existing services will be sufficient to support the increase in sewerage and water.
625	11	With the additional influx of people into the area this will put a burden on the facilities available in the town. Where will the extra doctors, dentists and fire men come from.
626	1	We do not agree that the proposed number of new houses is necessary for the Retford area, as may be the case in other areas of the country. There are already a large number of existing houses unsold and no employment prospects because of the loss of industry etc. over the years. There has already been a large development on the Bridon wire site and Thrumpton Lane area with hundreds of new houses being built there, so why do we need more? Where are all these people coming from to buy these houses, or is the development mainly for social housing as seems to be the main allocation at present?
626	2	The main area for concern is the increased potential flood risk. The land in question (numbered 3, 370, 511, 488, and 489) is a well known flood plain and absorbs a lot of the run off from the hills towards Grove. Since applications to develop some of this land have been previously refused on the grounds of flood risk, it seems unreasonable to include these areas in the strategic plan. Several incidences of serious flooding at the bottom of Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane have occurred of which you must be aware, and not only this immediate area will be put at additional risk if the land is developed, as the run off will exacerbate the problems in other areas such as Grove Lane, Blackstope Lane and Trent Street etc. This has all been pointed out previously in applications ref 1/94/1 73 and 1/1 /95/197. These past applications were to develop a small proportion of what is now proposed and these were refused because of the risk of flooding to neighbouring properties, so why now would the council accept a larger development with a significantly higher risk of causing severe flooding? The present drainage infrastructure is not designed to cope with further development and we wonder what Severn Trent Water Authority and National Rivers Authority make of these proposals.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
626	3	Traffic is already a problem at the junctions of Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane with London Road and the proposal to add over 600 homes will cause huge problems, especially at school start and leaving times. Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane were never designed to cater for the density of traffic which the proposed development would inevitably create, and there is no alternative access route.
626	4	Bracken Lane School is already oversubscribed so where would the children from these extra houses attend school?
626	5	The proposed development areas involve building outside the existing development envelope, and outside the borough boundary, and there would be a loss of good agricultural land.
626	6	There is already an existing problem with traffic at the Tiln Lane/Moorgate junction and this has increased significantly over the years. The proposal to add hundreds of new homes will cause huge problems particularly at school start and leaving times. The present road infrastructure is totally unsuitable for such a large development and the extra traffic that this would generate. Highway safety is a major concern particularly as Carr Hill School is already on a busy road used by HGVs avoiding the low bridge on the A620, and the children's safety would be compromised if further traffic were to use this already busy route.
626	7	Carr Hill School is already oversubscribed, so where would the children from the proposed 1130 houses attend school?
626	8	The proposed development areas involve building outside the existing development envelope, and outside the borough boundary, and there would be a loss of good agricultural land.
626	9	The proposed development would increase the risk of flooding to surrounding properties. When there is heavy rain the drainage system around Tiln Lane and surrounding roads already cannot cope with the quantity of water. How would the drainage system be able to cope when over a thousand extra homes are added into the equation. Elmwood Close already floods when there is heavy rain.
626	10	We have been told by other residents that the field at the bottom of Longholme Road is protected as there are natural springs on this land so how can the council even consider building on this land which surely must be a conservation area?
626	11	We would like to express our concern about the way that these proposed developments have been advertised. We only became aware about the proposal by word of mouth and saw nothing in the local paper. Apparently there was a small article in a Retford newspaper which went unnoticed to many residents. We feel that the council have tried to go under the radar and hoped that residents wouldn't notice their plans that affect the majority of Retford.
626	12	On a final note, Retford is a lovely historic market town, and we feel that these proposed developments will ruin it. The existing new developments in Retford are not in keeping with the older existing properties and certainly do not add any charm to a small historic market town.
626	13	Schools are already full, doctors surgeries already fully booked and Bassetlaw hospital is not equipped to accommodate all of the extra residents these developments would bring to the area. Car parks in town are already full on market days so where will all these people park to shop? The unemployed cannot find jobs so who will employ all of these extra residents, and who will pay compensation when existing houses flood because the council have accepted a development on a flood plain?
627	1	For as long as we have lived here (since 1988), fields 511 and 370 have been considered flood plain. These fields need to hold water draining from Grove hills until the beck/culvert can cope with carrying this water away from the area. To a lesser extent field 488 does a similar job. Despite this, in August 2004 and again, more seriously, in June 2007, this end of Bracken Lane was affected by flooding. In 2004 the drainage ditches along and adjacent to Bracken Lane were full and the pumping station on Bracken Lane was unable to cope with the volume of water. This resulted in the domestic drains back-filling with water, almost to the top of downstairs toilet bowls and some partial flooding of gardens. (Appendix 2 & 2A) In 2007 the situation was much worse and lasted for longer. Again, the pumping station could not cope and the beck and drainage ditches were full and overflowing onto Bracken Lane where the culvert passes under the Lane. Once again, domestic drains back-filled, this time to the extent that the one in my attached garage introduced water into the garage, but not, fortunately, into the house. The rear garden was more extensively flooded, for a much longer period and to the extent that water flowed down the side of the house to the front drive. (Appendix 3) This lasted, to various degrees, for two weeks. On one occasion at the start of the flooding, the fire service was in attendance pumping water from the Lane outside the pumping station far into the field between fields 511 and 488. We also know that in 2004 and 2007 houses/gardens at the end of Grove Coach Road were flooded and the Environment Agency June 2007 Flood Event Outline map shows that houses or gardens at the end of St Helens road were affected. Whilst field 488 suffers less from flooding, it is often water-logged and has not been used to grow crops 'properly' for many years. We understand that planning permission for the development of field 488 was declined at Ombudsman level in 1980, due to opposition from locals, Severn Trent, Environment Agency and Highways Authority. These organisations and locals also objected to an application to develop field 511 in 1996. Since the 2007 floods, nothing has been done to improve drainage in this area. Building 312 houses would severely aggravate the situation by removing most of the flood plain and adding much more 'hard' rain catchment area. It would also drastically increase domestic drainage/sewerage into a system which already has problems coping with current levels. As water from this area has to pass by the Blackstope Lane area, it would add to the problems that those residents suffer.
627	2	A further 312 houses in fields 511, 489 and 370 would drastically increase traffic, which would have to pass along Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road for access. Bracken Lane narrows just past the school and narrows further just past 50 Bracken Lane. Vehicles often have to pause opposite our house to wait for a vehicle coming down Bracken Lane to pass, before they can proceed. This stretch of lane is flanked on both sides by drainage ditches, making widening the lane a very difficult task. Bracken Lane has Junior, Infants and Nursery schools, which already generate problems with traffic and parking at peak times (school start/finish times), with cars parked well along Bracken Lane and on Bramble Road and Rose Avenue. Adding further traffic would increase the problems, including that of road safety. Grove Coach Road is an area of mainly older properties and is often congested because of on- road parking. Similar considerations therefore apply.
627	3	Bracken Lane School is, we understand, near to full capacity, as, we believe, is Thrumpton Lane School. The secondary schools have spare capacity, but are on the other side of Retford. All doctors' surgeries are on the other side of Retford.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
627	4	The development of the fields in question would necessitate the removal of many large trees and much old hedgerow. This, together with the loss of the fields themselves, would destroy a large area of natural habitat for wildlife.
628	1	I am a Trustee of the Douglas Rupert Clark deceased Will Trust, and a Partner of a firm of Solicitors in Retford. I am aware of the recent consultation, and confirm that I believe the Potential Housing Site reference 46 and 309 should be considered favourably, taking into account its location and availability, and also the willingness of the proprietors of each constituent part to actively consider development of the property.
628	2	It is considered that the site is highly suitable for residential development, given its location and favourable access point.
628	3	It is noted also that the site is surrounded on three sides by residential development and is likely to be treated more infill than encroaching into open countryside.
628	4	There is, I understand, total agreement between the land owners to see this site developed.
629	1	In my area of Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road (Retford) I consider the land unsuitable for future housing development due to the serious flooding problems we have had.
629	2	Every year my front garden is flooded and my front flowerbed is only capable of supporting rose bushes. When my husband was a school-boy in the winters of the 1920's he frequently skated on the nearby fields!! On several occasions we have had to sweep away the water away from our patio as it pours down the sloping terrain of our road.
629	3	Frequently I have been delayed by the problem of driving and entering London Road at peak times, morning and afternoon. I have counted 22 cars waiting to enter London Road.
629	4	Why do we require more housing when there are already hundreds of empty houses in our area?
630	1	I have been informed that the Bassetlaw District Council are proposing to develop over 1,130 houses on good agricultural land north of my current abode. It seems there has been no consultation with residents prior to the production of the proposals which comes as no surprise to me at all.
630	2	The additional traffic congestion and danger to road users and pedestrians on Tiln Lane is plain for all to see. There is already extra traffic using Tiln Lane at the moment that could use the main road to Welham and Clarbrough but are using it to avoid the speed limits in these areas.
630	3	Another of my concerns is the way these proposals will alter the character of the area,
630	4	and the loss of good agricultural land when all brownfield sites should be developed first.
630	5	The existing Highway Infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic
630	6	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used. Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
630	7	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road users and school children. HGV's have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
631	1	I wish to object to the building of 900 houses, near my house, off Bisby Road. I originally bought my property as I wished to live near to the edge of town, in a semi rural location. This development will make my street considerable less 'rural', as it would become in the middle of a large estate. On a daily basis I walk across the fields on which the development is proposed, and my dog runs amongst the Willows. I will lose this amenity and, the character will be significantly changed. I wanted to live on the edge of the development envelope, now I will be in the middle of it.
631	2	The increased traffic travelling toward the new houses will also make the walk to the site more dangerous and less pleasant. My dog and grandchildren will be unhappy walking for miles along busy roads, where once it was pretty.
632	1	I would like to object to the proposed planning of 1700 houses in the Worksop Area. I have looked at the proposed sites and feel the loss of Greenbelt/farm land would be catastrophic especially Option 1. As well as the loss of beautiful scenery and wildlife the rambling running/bridleway paths would be lost forever to more concrete box houses.
632	2	The other main objection I have is that it would be very near the smelly sewage works which in the summer is especially awful, in summer we have to suffer disgraceful smells night upon nights. Because there is open Greenland does this always mean something has to be built upon it.
632	3	Will Worksop amenities be able to cope with a large influx of people?
632	4	The police station/service a hospital with theatre service/ward closures in the Guardian every year, road traffic problem, narrow roads, parked cars chaos and where would the extra jobs come from, no jobs at moment for our young people.
633	1	We think Tiln Lane (the only access) is far too narrow for the amount of traffic that would be going through. Its busy enough already as lorries use this to avoid the low bridge also there is a school crossing on Tiln Lane.
633	2	There are houses standing empty now so what is the point of building more
633	3	Do not take greenfield sites take brownfield sites first. Greenbelt areas are a precious commodity and we should try to hang on to them.
634	1	In March 2011 we received a questionnaire about the future development in Blyth and asking for any suitable land for infill/ development. We wrote suggesting our farmyard but had no reply. When my husband attended the meeting in Blyth on December 14th he noticed Mr Moore's fields allocated as possible sites but no mention of our suggestion. We feel it is possible that our letter was lost in the post so are mentioning our proposal again. Our farmyard Bridge Farm, Blyth is directly opposite Mr Platt's farm buildings which have now been developed. We feel we have a strong case to put forward our buildings for infill/ development.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
635	1	Although the site has been identified for high quality employment use since the mid 1990's the site is not considered to be viable for employment purposes. A report was prepared by NG Chartered Surveyors in April 2011 and an Executive Summary of that report is included -see Appendix 3. It states that to bring forward an employment business scheme on this site is highly unlikely. Both now and in the foreseeable future. This is based on the cost of infrastructure provision, end values (development costs would exceed completed value) and speculative development would not be viable with such a lowly projected profit margin. Against this backdrop we respond the questions relevant to Worksop & Gateford.
635	2	We agree in principle with the screening methodology and we use the criteria (in the 'Summary & Conclusion' section) to comment on the suitability of Site 28/W6: Land at Gateford Common to be identified as a residential led mixed use development site.
635	3	We consider that the town could be allocated more housing and employment growth if a scheme was developed in such a way that it would benefit the regeneration of the town. We consider that this is possible. A large sustainable urban extension (SUE) / new residential quarter of a 1,000 plus units at Gateford could change the perception of Worksop as a place to work and live. A comparable case study would be Gainsborough in Lincolnshire, where the growth agenda has led to a new SUE being granted planning permission this year (2011). New housing, employment, schools, and retail space accompanied with large area of public open space (both formal and informal) is aiming to attract new investment to the town which can only take place with a major regeneration scheme. Land at Gateford Road and Gateford Common could deliver that vision to Worksop but land at Gateford Common alone has the ability to deliver a mix of uses in a location that would be attractive to the housing market. (Please see Appendix 4 for National Plc. house builders who have already expressed an interest in the site and the opportunity).
635	4	We act on behalf of the landowners who are the freehold owners of land referenced as Site 28/W6: Land at Gateford Common. We support the development of this land as a housing led mixed use development.
635	5	As above we support Site 28/W6: Land at Gateford Common as capable of accommodating an element of employment land in the future (the southern element fronting on to Claylands Avenue).
635	6	We support the allocation of Site 28/W6: Land at Gateford Common for mixed use residential led development.
635	7	The site history and most recent commercial appraisal of the site indicates that the employment potential of the site is only likely to be delivered through a cross subsidy of development which would deliver a higher land value - i.e. residential.
635	8	The site has a very clear defensible boundary - the outer ring road - and its development would be consistent with neighbouring land uses (residential and employment land). It forms the last parcel of land within the urban area / extent of Worksop and as such it is entirely appropriate for this parcel of land to accord with the residential development to North East and North West of Gateford Common.
635	9	Development would not encroach upon the wider open countryside, although the land itself is essentially open and access points could be delivered from the north, east, south and west.
635	10	Importantly we believe that in the current market it is essential to identify sites (the very best sites) that are most deliverable and attractive to the housing market. This site in the context of the local housing market and the wider town area has to be considered as a 'top ranking' site.
635	11	We consider that it is important for any site to consider the matter of access at an early stage as it is the cornerstone of development deliverability. In this regard our client has already employed the services of Sanderson Associates (Highways Engineers) to review the site. The site (as proposed in the consultation document) indicates employment to the south and residential development to the north and it is on this basis that four points of access have been considered appropriate as access points into the site. They are from (1) Gateford Road, (2) Kirkpatrick Drive, (3) Claylands Avenue and (4) Gateford Toll Bar. The easiest way to conceptualize this is by looking at a plan and we have attached a technical drawing within Appendix 5 and a simple master plan to show this. Access from road points 1, 2 and 4 would be ideally suited to the proposed residential development and the access from 3 would be solely used by the employment site. An emergency access would be considered linking Claylands Avenue with Gateford Road. Although a full Transport Statement would be required to accompany a specific development proposal it has already been identified that the site is accessible and with development of the site, accessibility could be further readily improved. The potential improvements for sustainable travel and the positive effects of 'travel planning', would reduce the development traffic so as not to have an unacceptable impact on either Worksop or Gateford.
635	12	During the period of this consultation we have also been asked to consider the potential implications of new housing growth and the need to provide new primary school places or a new primary school. We understand that the County Education Team consider that Gateford is a location where a new school would be required. In principle we do not object to land being made available for a new school but it would have to be considered in the context of a development viability appraisal which would factor into account matters such as utility costs, affordable housing, etc. The delivery of a school would reduce the overall level of employment land. This is a matter that we would like to discuss with both Bassetlaw DC and the County Council.
635	13	Taking into account the previously submitted representations we have made and referenced in this letter (letter to Bassetlaw DC on the 10/10/11 -see Appendix 2) we still consider that SHLAA Site 29 (Gateford Road) should be identified as a SHLAA 'developable site' (for housing or mixed use) on the 'Worksop Plan' – (Page 25 of the document). This is a matter which we would like Bassetlaw DC to review so that the merits of the site can be discussed in the open forum of a Planning Hearing in 2012 and in front of the duly appointed Planning Inspector. The basis of arguing this case is based upon the assessment criteria used by Bassetlaw - namely the Suitability of the Site criteria (Page 10 & 11) and the Availability of the Site (Page 11). However, as set out in the 'Introduction', these representations principally relate to the currently identified land for development at Gateford Common.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
635	14	We have identified that we support the allocation of the land at Site 28/W6: Land at Gateford Common for a residential led mixed use development allocation. The allocation is supported (in the broadest context) by the November 2011 Inspectors Report which identifies Worksop as the focus of development in Bassetlaw to 2028. Importantly we consider that the wider area should be considered for development of a much larger scale -a potential sustainable urban extension. This would include land on the north side of Gateford Road which we consider has been incorrectly 'screened out'. However, we do support the allocation at Gateford Common. Taking into account the Site Allocations Screening Methodology on Page 10 development of the site would be both suitable and available. Taking into account all of the listed criteria and its former / current allocation for employment development we recommend to Bassetlaw that the site should be identified as a preferred site for development and allocation.
636	1	We are writing primarily as residents since 1979 of the Grove Coach Road area of Retford, so with strong interests in the planning situation for the area on the eastern boundary around, and further to the east and north of the end of, the built-up area at the ends of Grove Coach Road, St Helen's Road, St Stephen's Road and Bracken Lane. We oppose the inclusion for potential housing of the following specific areas, as numbered on the map on pages 38-39 of your consultation document: 370; 511; 488.
636	2	There is wide awareness among local residents, and among officers of and elected representatives on the District Council, of the reasons for which these fields should not be developed. Since we have lived in this area there have been three planning applications, two of which were for 511 and 488. Both were rejected. The 1981 application for 488 went to appeal, but was rejected there. Only the earlier (1979) application by Maclean for development of the area adjoining 370 succeeded, but in defiance of reason and with strict conditions attached -none of which, however, represented anything more than a token attempt to address the surface water drainage problem. We are therefore alarmed that our local planning authority (LPA), which should be protecting our fragile drainage environment, has accepted once-again-recycled proposals from landowners to include these areas in a formal consultative document. This implies that no reasons were found to exclude them. But, as you know, the suitability for development of areas 511 and 488 has been exhaustively investigated as the result of planning applications. Both were rejected. 488 (1981) went to a public enquiry after an appeal. The DOE inspector did not mince his words in explaining his reasons for rejection (see Appendix E). In the case of 511, in December 1995, the developer must have realised the futility of appealing and withdrew an application to do so (see Appendix B). Of these three areas, only 370 has, as far as we know, not been the subject of a past application. However, the reasons for which applications for 511 and 488 were rejected apply equally to 370. In the case of the 1981 appeal against refusal of permission to develop 488 the defence was mounted very effectively by our Council. This same council is now proposing to include this area, and 511 and 370, in a block plan of areas potentially suitable for development! This is a disturbing move. These areas should have been excluded from your current consultative document because of the inadequate local surface water disposal arrangements. Your office has full knowledge of this. Whilst they will now, we trust, be removed, their inclusion, even at this stage, will have given rise to expectations among the landowners. You may say that if these sites go forward to your 2012 "Preferred Options" document, this will not imply that they will automatically gain planning consent. However, it will mean that they are considered a priori potentially suitable. This would be dangerous, for the following reasons: i) The decision to include them in the final block plan would be taken by officers of the LPA. If a planning application was subsequently made, the councillors considering the application would find it bizarre and contradictory if their officers advised that these areas were unsuitable for development. This might well give rise to an inappropriate outcome. ii) With reference to Appendix F, a vote which rejects a planning application, especially one which may be thought controversial, is often not unanimous. A frequent reason for this (see the same Appendix) is concern that a refusal will result in an appeal which will be upheld. In such a case the planning authority normally has to pay the appellant's costs. When the 1995 application for 511 was considered, three councillors apparently voted against, one stating that it was for this reason. If justified, this would be a very good reason for doubting the wisdom of rejecting an application, as appeal costs are usually very high. On that occasion, this concern was not justified, because of the area's history of flooding, but councillors may prefer caution. If there are planning grounds for rejecting an application and if the application succeeds on appeal, costs are not usually awarded against the LPA. However, should any of areas 511, 488 and 370 appear even in your 2012 Preferred Options document, councillors' presumption will be that there are in principle no planning objections. Anxiety among committee members about the financial consequences to the LPA if an application is rejected at local level and then succeeds on appeal would be understandable, so it is likely that the application would be passed. If an application succeeds, no-one -public officer, elected representative or local resident has any right of appeal, however disastrous the consequences of the application for nearby properties etc. The only forms of recourse available are very expensive and complicated -e.g., judicial review, a claim against an LPA for maladministration.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
636	3	<p>CONFLICT WITH NATIONAL OR LOCAL PLANNING POLICY Your online map confirms that all these areas, as we and you well know, include flood plane of the upper section of the Retford Beck. If these areas are built up they will be raised above the flood level by removing water storage capacity in the present floodpl8!1e. Unless sustainable drainage solutions (SUDS) are adopted for them, as well as for the areas currently drained by this section of the Retford Beck, the result of such development will be to move the floodplain into the lower lying parts of adjoining built-up areas, which have already experienced serious garden flooding from the Beck over the last thirty years. In one case a house has been flooded several times to the extent of making it temporarily uninhabitable, and, during the 2007 floods , to result in its needing major internal refurbishment. Without sustainable drainage solutions (SU DS) for these areas, and those adjoining them, the lives and properties of existing residents, at least those close to the Beck, will be damaged if these areas are developed. Their properties are also likely to become uninsurable and blighted. This would be true if even only one of the three areas was developed. While the risk in this area is not of fluvial flooding as such, the Beck is a stream-like land-drain, and discharges into the river Idle. It is therefore a direct tributary of the river. It would be unrealistic to claim that there is an absolute difference between the "type" of flooding which occurs in the floodplain of the Idle and in that of the Beck. It is only a matter of degree/extent. In parts of the area where we live, indirect fluvial flooding ("non-fluvial" flooding) can be as disruptive and potentially disastrous as direct fluvial flooding. The Planning Policy Statement 25 (Development and Flood Risk) sets out the Government's national policies on this question and provides detailed guidance to local planning authorities. We consider that the areas of Retford which are the focus of our submission fall indisputably within the scope of this Statement, perusal of which leads to the conclusion that, apart from other planning considerations, to be considered later, these areas should be developed only if a workable SUDS is implemented. IS A WORKABLE SUDS POSSIBLE? In 1995 we made two submissions to the Bassetlaw District Council opposing the development of area 511 (see Appendix A). These applications -for 135 houses rather than the 158 now proposed -were rejected by the Council. An appeal by the applicant was subsequently withdrawn. A copy of the letters sent to us by the Council detailing the reasons for rejecting the application is attached as Appendix B to this submission. The section dealing with flooding is numbered (5). In these submissions, coverage of the Beck and its flooding problems is numbered 2 in the first and 4 in the second. This coverage, now over 16 years old, is still as relevant as when it was drafted, because nothing material has changed. The Beck has been adopted by the Environment Agency. So far, the EA have worked only on the section to the west of the Grove Lane railway level crossing -as described in their summary of this work which we attach as Appendix C. This has involved clearing out the ditch to the immediate east of the start of the 500 metre long converted section, and repairing a section of culvert. It does not include increasing the capacity of the section of the culvert under the canal. This is a bottleneck -even if it is in perfect condition, which, given its great age, is inconceivable. Expert evidence given at the 1981 Public Enquiry into an application by a Mr Horrocks to develop the field now numbered 488 stated that the twin pipes taking the culvert under the canal each has a diameter of 36" (0.9144 m), so a total cross-sectional area of 1.3134 m'. Describing this as a pinch-point, or bottleneck, the expert witness contrasted it with the modern section of culvert to the west of the canal: 2.50 m' -almost twice the cross-sectional area of the old pipes at the pinch-point. It is reasonable to assume that the calculations which were made for the new section of culvert on the west side of the canal, which was laid during the construction of Arlington Way at the end of the 1970s, and which diverted the course of the Beck from its original problematical route under the town centre to a new outfall point roughly opposite where the Morrison's store now is, took account of the volumes of water likely to flow through the culvert at peak times. Our Council declared during the 1980s that it would invest in turning the Beck into an efficient surface water drain. This plan was abandoned, on cost grounds. Had it been carried out, the 1995 planning application might have succeeded. However, as you should know, there were grounds additional to surface water drainage for rejecting it. If the Environment Agency, which is now responsible for the Beck, clears out its whole length back to above Grove Coach Road, this may assist the area where we live , though to a very limited extent, by increasing the present derisory storage capacity of this neglected watercourse and removing obstructions to flow. However, the net result would be negative for the areas adjoining Grove Lane to the immediate east of the canal. More water would arrive there in peak times, but it would be no more able to pass through the old culvert and under the canal into the modern higher capacity tubes than now. If the river again backed up through the culvert, as it did in 2007, the situation of the residents of this area would be even worse than it was then. Other factors concerning the Beck and its culvert became apparent during the 2007 floods, which had severe effects in the section of Grove Lane and adjoining streets next to the culvert and caused serious flooding to gardens and at least one property adjoining the Beck, as already</p> <p>The narrowness, and, east of the Beck, extreme narrowness, of Bracken Lane. At the cost of loss of ecological habitat, rural environment and arable land, the eastern section could be widened. It could be widened west of the Beck only as far as the western edge of 488.</p>
636	4	
636	5	The impact on the Bracken Lane/London Road junction (a crossroads) of the greatly increased traffic flows along Bracken Lane.
636	6	The already overstretched Bracken Lane would be one of two access roads to area 511 and the sole direct access road to area 488.
636	7	Grove Coach Road, already heavily used, would be an alternative access road to area 511 and the sole access road to area 370.
636	8	The junctions of both these roads with London Road would need traffic lights. The cross-roads where Bracken Lane joins London Road arguably already does.
636	9	The unsuitability of the leg of Bracken Lane, after it turns left at the T-junction at Black's farm and follows the Retford eastern boundary, for development as a suitable alternative route for much increased traffic flows towards Leverton road/the town centre. The "road" shown on OS maps connecting the T-junction where Bracken Lane joins Grove Lane to Leverton Road is an unmade private road. The "rat run" route from London Road to Leverton Road down Bracken Lane therefore involves a very narrow lane through Little Gringley. Either of these possibilities as a main route would be very expensive to develop, and controversial in at least the second case. There would be pressure to replace the Grove Lane level crossing by a bridge/underlie, with consequences for at least one property. The bridge carrying Grove Street over the canal is one-way and has traffic lights. This bridge would need rebuilding and widening. Only to the west of this bridge is the route suitable for increased traffic flows.
636	10	LOSS OF TREES OR HEDGEROWS The very large hedgerows to each side of Bracken Lane on the east side of the Beck would be lost. If the second stretch of Blacken Lane, after the T junction, was widened to take increased traffic volumes the extent of the loss would be very large. The section of lane which is an extension of Grove Coach Road (the right turn at the same T junction) and which would be the access road to a development on area. 511 would also lose both its hedgerows.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
636	11	LOSS OF ECOLOGICAL HABITATS OR LANDSCAPES The verges and large hedgerows of the sections of Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road referred to above are important ecological habitats. The landscape of areas 488 and 511, at least, is arable land, attractive and an important "green lung" for the town which does not have the benefit of many such areas immediately adjoining built-up areas. The lanes around 488 and 511 would cease to offer their present excellent walking and cycling opportunities. This would be a serious loss also in view of national and local schemes encouraging healthier lifestyles. It would also be regrettable to lose the potentially excellent arable land of these areas. These areas appear to be under-utilized by local farmers and relegated mainly to spasmodic grazing. There is a world food shortage and it cannot make long-term economic sense to build on good farming land where other land less suitable for this purpose is also available -as is the case around the Retford boundary, and as your map in the consultation document shows.
636	12	DESIGN, APPEARANCE, LAYOUT, DENSITY AND MASS OF BUILDINGS 158 houses for area 511 implies a much higher density than in the existing areas immediately to the west of the Beck. This would be out of keeping with the local built environment.
636	13	In addition, we are concerned at the impact on the foul drainage system. The point to which the foul drains of a development on 511 would run by gravity is at the T junction where the Grove Coach Road extension joins Bracken Lane. This would also be true for areas 370 and 488. For 488 the flow would be against the fall of the land, so a supplementary pumping station would be needed. The nearest public gravity sewer runs in a loop to/from London Road via Grove Coach Road, Bramble Road and Bracken Lane. The sewage from most of the 1960s part and all the 1970s part of the Grove Coach estate, plus some houses off the older section of Grove Coach Road, runs through a gravity sewer to a pumping station close to the Beck on the north side of Bracken Lane. Sewage from the later Maclean extension to this estate runs via a separate gravity sewer to the same pump. From the pumping station, sewage is pumped up under Bracken Lane, because of the opposing gradient, and discharges into the public gravity sewer near the corner of Bramble Road and Bracken Lane. Sewage from houses developed on 511, 370 and 488. There seems no alternative to pumping this up under Bracken Lane to the same gravity sewer. This would mean extra sewage from a potential total of 312 houses. We question whether the existing gravity sewer and the sewer into which this drains under London Road are capable of sustaining such a large increase in load.
636	14	The mains water branches supplying the Grove Coach Estate etc. would need increasing in size where they run from London Road under Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane, and extending.
636	15	Bracken Lane School As this stands, it would be inadequate to the demands of anything approaching the maximum capacity of these three areas. It is a single storey building. To extend it would mean either rebuilding it on its present site or building a completely new school on part of the new development area/s. Either of these possibilities would have a further impact on the environment.
636	16	You identify potential development areas for new housing around Retford with a maximum total capacity of 3,894 dwellings. Areas 488, 511 and 370 are shown as for potentially 312 houses -8% of that total. However, the total possible capacity of all the areas shown (3,894 dwellings) greatly exceeds even the net possible demand, which your own document states to be 577 (page 35), This is only 14.81% of the total capacity shown as possible, and only 64% of just one set of linked areas on your map (7+46+309). This alone is shown as having a potential for 899 dwellings. With such a huge difference between potential and estimated requirements we request that you eliminate now from your proposals areas which are problematical/sensitive such as 488, 511 and 370.
636	17	Given the state of the local economy and the town's failure to attract new employment (even enough to replace that lost through recent major closures), despite its excellent transport links, and the historic aura and architecture of a remarkably well preserved market town, we question why you feel the need to overshoot any possible estimated requirement for new dwellings by such a large factor (x 6.75).
636	18	We also, as in 1995, draw attention to the large (now very large) numbers of unsold, generally fairly affordable (by market standards), new and second hand dwellings in Retford. If there is no market for these, why should there be a market for an additional 577?
636	19	Appendices provided covering: A 1995 submissions to the LPA regarding the application to develop 511. B Notice of the withdrawal of an appeal against the LPA's rejection of the above application. C Summary of recent work carried out on the Beck by the Environment Agency. D Part of the front page of the Retford Times, 02/03/1995. E The DOE inspector's report of 1981 rejecting the Horrocks appeal against the LPA's refusal to grant planning permission for development of field 488. F Report in the Retford Times, 23/03/1995.
637	1	I think that Beckingham has had enough development there should be no more development.
637	2	Planning was passed for a public house as I have built my house adjacent to public house I am totally against this I now know.
637	3	The farmer landowner wants to build houses on it. Which I said any many agreed from day one.
637	4	Now the Parish Council say they don't want a pub at that location, and want it at first application, which is opened the door for housing. This is outside the village envelope and is green field. I enclose my letter of objection.
637	5	How can the schools cope with extra housing?
637	6	The drains capacity cope
637	7	Sewers
637	8	Water table
637	9	The public house I have and many other people have been saying for 2 years now that the prime aim was to get Mr Pickering the land owner planning for houses which I hate to say I told you so. Now bank will loan money to A. buy land for public house, B. finance public house, C. the public house will never happen in this climate at first proposal of 2nd proposal we will end up with housing.
637	10	Location 106 public house site is A. greenfield

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
637	11	B. should be protected open space
637	12	C. I ask you is there any greenfield sites that are safe.
637	13	D. Beckingham will become a very large housing estate not attractive as a village anymore
637	14	One last point would people who are proposing development please drive round the village to see the amount of housing in the village.
638	1	Yes
638	2	no, it is already crowded enough
638	3	9, 30, 90, 28
638	4	w1, w12
638	5	195,343, w8, 28, w6
638	6	yes, especially the golf course area, Worksop is far too built up already
638	7	yes
638	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
638	9	Around existing sites
638	10	Separately, so there is no confusion between the two
639	1	Include regeneration of unused/abandoned housing and sites in the town centre and current areas of housing.
639	2	No, regeneration should be considered of town centre sites that are unused.
639	3	I think location 35 is unsuitable
639	4	site 4/w9, I think option 2 is the most suitable
639	5	yes
639	6	If/when you build more houses then you will have to consider availability of primary school places and provision of doctors surgeries.
639	7	Yes to the feedback, but no to the advertising of it, i should be more widely advertised, e.g., by leaflets delivered door to door
639	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
640	1	This would depend on the properties intended to be built. Are they to be built for the private buyer or for the housing benefits claimants.
640	2	I think location 35 is unsuitable
640	3	Vesuvius site
640	4	REMOVED
640	5	Area 35 should be protected. most of us bought houses on Gateford for the wide open countryside. As a resident of Gateford for 16 years we have little in the way of Council provided resources but have the countryside as compensation to enjoy. We continue to provide major cash flow to the council and I personally feel that all political parties wish to add to the coffers with nothing in return due to restrictions placed on them by the Government
640	6	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
640	7	no
640	8	I wish to object strongly to the development of any houses at site 35 based on the below reasons: The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. Any increase in housing on the estate will make this situation intolerable and dangerous to residents and visitors.
640	9	Increased traffic levels on the estate generally reducing the quality of our environment, increasing noise levels, pollution and increasing danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
640	10	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape.
640	11	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
640	12	The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
640	13	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment.
640	14	This bridleway is used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users. The loss of this countryside would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Plantation.
640	15	Our local shops which are sited off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, especially as one of the shops became an ASDA. Additional housing will cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas.
640	16	Our local schools (primary, secondary and school based nurseries) are already at capacity.
641	1	I think location 35 is totally unsuitable for any further development. There would have to be a major infrastructure development.
641	2	The present schools are not able to accept any more pupils.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
641	3	The road system is already far too busy and more dangerous than ever.
641	4	The sewage system is well over capacity and regularly fails
641	5	The wooded area is home to large numbers of rare birds and other flora and fauna.
641	6	The general feeling of the community is that it is not needed and will spoil what is already here. This is likely only to benefit greedy building companies and not the present residents. There is no requirement for such large numbers of houses. It will only attract people from outside of the area and is likely to be unaffordable to most current residents.
641	7	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
642	1	No the infrastructure for Worksop is insufficient to sustain any further housing. It is saturated already with no real new amenities provided for the people living - it has already taken nearly 10 years to get a Cinema.
642	2	I think location 35 is unsuitable as there will be a strain on schools and services, worse traffic at local shops, increased pollution.
642	3	Further destruction of farmed agricultural land.
642	4	Increased traffic problem as already there is a great problem trying to get onto and off the main highway, mainly Gateford Road. No solution has been presented to the residents already living there.
642	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
643	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
643	2	The Gateford area does not have enough facilities for the current level of housing i.e. adequate schools, doctors, chemist, post office
643	3	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
643	4	REMOVED
644	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable as the current infrastructure cannot support this development
644	2	I understand the route into this development will be via Churchill Way. This is only a small road and cannot safely accommodate the traffic generated by an additional 700 homes. There is already too much traffic in this area
644	3	In a morning the queue to get out of the very dangerous junction on Gateford Road often stretches back to the 2nd roundabout. Adding another 700 houses would see this go back all the way to Eddison Park Ave.
644	4	Gateford Park primary school is already full so where will the children go from this development.
644	5	There are already quite a few properties in Gateford that have been for sale for a long time i.e. over 2 years, therefore I do not believe that there is a requirement for any further houses
644	6	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
645	1	There has been no consultation with residents prior to the production of this proposal.
645	2	The development will alter the character of the area.
645	3	The present road infrastructure is unsuitable for such a development.
645	4	There will be a loss of valuable and useful agricultural land.
645	5	There will be added congestion and danger to pedestrians and road users on Tiln Lane, which is already congested due to the Carr Hill School traffic at peak times of day.
645	6	The junction at Tiln Lane with Moorgate is unsuitable to further traffic load.
645	7	The proposed areas involve building outside the existing development area
645	8	The proposal involves building outside the borough boundary
645	9	All brownfield sites should be developed for housing before developing the edge of town and beyond the borough boundary
645	10	Furthermore there will be a loss of trees and countryside and there will be loss of privacy for residents adjacent to developed areas
645	11	The road safety and road access issues are particularly worrying as many children use this area on foot going to school
645	12	In addition to this I understand that there is a proposal to develop a travellers site in the area, which has not been made public. This is totally unacceptable for the area above listed reasons.
646	1	My husband and I oppose the proposed housing development and that the land should remain green open space, I have lived here all my life 44 years and hope this will never happen we need to keep green land for our children.
647	1	Yes I agree with the development of 9 houses.
647	2	Careful consideration should be given as to where such development takes place for reasons of safety, access etc.
647	3	Site 266 because I think this is known as the dog walking site with a public footpath, which can be re-routed around the field
647	4	Any access to Retford Road could be opened with the minimum of risk. This land is not used for farming
647	5	Site 214 is agricultural and too large for development of a small housing plot/site.
647	6	Too valuable as farming land.
648	1	I agree that land should be allocated in Blyth for a MAXIMUM of 9 houses.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
648	2	Plot 213 or 589 or 369
648	3	The above plots, I feel, would not be suitable for sheltered housing. I feel that Blyth is not a particularly good location for elderly people needing care due to current village amenities and cut backs in social service budgets.
648	4	Looking at the green areas on the map there are relatively FEW open spaces which should be preserved at all costs
648	5	I am concerned about development in Blyth because the electricity supply is already frequently interrupted
648	6	The drains / sewers won't cope. When it rains heavily there are many "water features" in Ryton Fields.
648	7	The infrastructure of the village is already overloaded and detrimental to such an historic village.
648	8	Plots 266 and 517 would exit on to an extremely busy stretch of road where people are doing excessive speeds
648	9	Between 7:40 and 8:50 and in the evening sit can take up to 15 minutes to exit Retford Road in to High Street due to volume of traffic.
648	10	I moved to Blyth fully cognisant of the village and its uniqueness which I wish to retain.
649	1	Yes
649	2	Option A
649	3	No. we have 70+ new houses being constructed on the detention centre site. we need to establish what impact this will have on a village with no facilities other than a pub.
649	4	Plot 134 should be developed as the existing buildings are severely dilapidated and in a dangerous condition.
649	5	Plot 135 has a 1960's bungalow on it with a field/paddock at the rear. Extending or modifying the property should be allowed.
649	6	However developing the site for multi housing should not be allowed.
649	7	Low Street is very narrow with no footpaths. In numerous places it is less than 4m wide and cannot be widened. It is regularly blocked by refuse wagons and oil delivery wagons. Directing more vehicles onto Low Street could be potentially dangerous.
649	8	No
649	9	Yes
649	10	REMOVED
649	11	REMOVED
650	1	Option A
651	1	Having seen the proposals for the use of land north of Retford, and in particular beyond Durham Grove. Palmer Road, Bigsby Road and Park Lane area, we are understandably very concerned about the effect it will have on this residential area
651	2	All these roads are accessed by Tiln Lane, a very congested road leading to Clarborough and beyond, used by heavy duty vehicles to avoid low bridges and by a large junior school which generates great amounts of traffic during the day, adding to the danger for pedestrians and local road users and is already inadequate for the amount of traffic using it.
651	3	Durham Grove does not currently have access to the agricultural land at the end of the cul-de-sac where the proposed development is intended and the road would be far too narrow for the traffic it would generate; during the construction phase it would be totally unsuitable for large and heavy vehicles causing damage to properties.
651	4	The land north of this area is valuable agricultural land and in this time of shortage of food production would this be a wise step to take in the interest of conservation? There is an abundance of wildlife in this area
651	5	This area of Retford is much sought after due to its stability and very few problems, the S influx of a proposed 900 homes would alter the dynamics greatly
651	6	There are a large number of unoccupied homes to be found in Retford and surely utilising these would eliminate the need for more use of green field land
651	7	The proposed areas involve building outside the borough boundary when there are already several large developments being built within Retford. With the loss of traditional manufacturing industries there are insufficient employment opportunities in the area to meet the demands of an increased population
651	8	Before any of these proposals are acted upon full consultation with current residents needs to be implemented together with all other service providers who would be affected
652	1	having seen the proposals for the use of land north of Retford, and in particular beyond Durham Grove, Palmer Road, Bigsby Road and Park Lane area, we are understandably very concerned about the affect it will have on this residential area
652	2	All these roads are accessed by Tiln Lane, a very congested road leading to Clarborough and beyond, used by heavy duty lorry's to avoid the low bridges and by large junior school which generates great amounts of traffic during the day, adding to the danger for pedestrians and local road users and is already inadequate for the amount of traffic using it. The estate roads mentioned would not be suitable for the amount of traffic created by an increase in the number of proposed residential homes. Durham Grove does not currently have access to the agricultural land at the end of the cul-de-sac where the proposed development is intended and the road would be far too narrow for the traffic it would generate; during the construction phase it would be totally unsuitable for large and heavy vehicles causing damage to properties and the drainage systems.
652	3	The land north of this area is valuable agricultural land and in this time of shortage of food production would this be a wise step to take in the interest of conservation? There is an abundance of wildlife in this area.
652	4	This area of Retford is much sough after due to its stability and very few problems, the influx of a proposed 900 homes would alter the dynamics greatly.
652	5	There are a large number of unoccupied homes to be found in Retford and surely utilising these would eliminate the need for more use of green field land.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
652	6	The proposed areas involve building outside the borough boundary when there are already several large developments being built within Retford. With the loss of traditional manufacturing industries there are insufficient employment opportunities in the area to meet the demands of an increased population.
652	7	Before any of these proposals are acted upon, full consultation with current residents needs to be implemented together with all other service providers who would be affected.
652	8	The drainage system is already prone to flooding
652	9	If an increase in traffic and parking is to take place, access for emergency vehicles would be severely restricted.
653	1	I think Location 35 is unsuitable
653	2	i think open spaces in and around towns are important. i believe they should be protected
653	3	At some point all towns need to stop expanding, the reuse of old sites is a much better option than destroying open areas and surround country side
653	4	At some point all towns need to stop expanding, the reuse of old sites is a much better option than destroying open areas and surround country side
653	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
654	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
654	2	Yes, the current 'potential protected open spaces' should be fully protected and NEVER be built upon
654	3	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
655	1	i think location 35 is unsuitable already plenty of housing in that area there are already not enough schools also extra traffic may be a hazard
655	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
656	1	I strongly feel site 35 is unsuitable, I feel Gateford has sufficient housing and any more would unnecessary strain on current resources.
656	2	It would also cause added traffic congestion making Gateford even harder to access and exit at peak times.
656	3	It would take away beautiful countryside and views
656	4	Take away privacy
656	5	Cause a detrimental impact on house prices
657	1	Location 35. I cannot see the sense of building on arable land at a time when there is a world food shortage.
657	2	This land also backs onto woodland and is a haven for wildlife, pheasants, rabbits, hares and deer all of which can be seen by the many individuals who use this area for walking, mountain biking and general leisure activities. The increased traffic would have a significant effect on the residents of Gateford Hill Care Home who regularly use the road system for wheelchair access to the local amenities and the many young children we have across the estates.
657	3	Please protect our countryside and the environment it creates, at a time when environmental issues are high on the Governments agenda
657	4	Option A
658	1	I think that location 35 is unsuitable for various reasons
658	2	Option A
659	1	I think that location 35 is unsuitable. My main concern is the traffic generation this development will cause along with road safety issues. As it is at the moment, there is severe congestion when entering and leaving the Gateford estate at peak times. If the volume of vehicles in the estate increases, then this will become a serious problem
659	2	Another concern I have with the new development is the lack of facilities available. For example, schooling, there is very limited space in the local primary schools and even less in the comprehensive schools
659	3	Loss of ecological habitats, landscapes and hedgerows is also one of the points in this development I am concerned about. There is small selection of local wildlife including pheasants and a family of hedgehogs that live in the area of the build. I enjoy seeing the wildlife and such on regular dog walks through the estate and in particular location 35.
659	4	This is a common dog walking route, for most houses in the Gateford area
659	5	As stated at the beginning of this, my main issue is with the increase of traffic. One of the main routes to the location is the road that my house is located on, the house itself faces the road, so the additional traffic will be visible and there will be an increase in noise pollution too.
659	6	Option A
660	1	Location 35 is unsustainable in the Gateford area as Gateford is a huge site already.
660	2	Even more houses will mean more congestion to roads in Gateford. Gateford is horrendous in the mornings to get onto the main road tail backs are backed up to the previous roundabouts
660	3	Gateford and the surrounding area will not be able to tackle the amount of children needing to enter into nursery and primary and even comprehensive education as the school are heaving already.
660	4	The local shops on Celtic Point is also horrendous for the amount of traffic entering and leaving the shopping area, which will lead to even more tail backs.
660	5	Do we really need to chop down trees and destroy the landscape for more houses which aren't even needed just to satisfy the greedy landowners.
660	6	Option A
661	1	No sorry. Direct consultation with the people that will be directly affected before any site is to be looked at. That way, suitable sites will be recognised before they are explored.
661	2	Employment is not always produced as a result of new building, or new sites - consideration must be given to improving what we have and upgrading the infrastructure we already have

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
661	3	Site reference 35 is unsuitable now and even if the current vehicular access was to be improved for those that currently live there, it would only exacerbate the congested roads in that area, especially access and exit to and from Gateford Road as at present. The problem is not always the roads and footpaths in the proposed area, but the knock on effect it would have on other, already congested roads. It is impossible to accept that no one knows there is not a problem at present, what would another 618 houses achieve.
661	4	The area marked 35 is currently high quality arable land, used year in year out as such. Woodland adjacent to the site proposal is ancient and scheduled, with bridleways and footpaths used and enjoyed by the already over populated area of Gateford and beyond
661	5	I am experienced in the construction and make up of highways roads and their usage. The area marked in 35 would have to have additional work. The current access, egress and motor vehicle usage makes Ashes Park Avenue, unsuitable at present, yet alone the extra vehicular and pedestrian use. Ashes Park Avenue, at present, is unable to cope with the traffic either vehicular or pedestrian especially during peak times. At present, one could be waiting 10-15 minutes to pass along that road and enter Gateford Road, introducing more activity would mean additional and expensive reconstruction to the current set up, which is required now. The current set up is inadequate.
661	6	Option A
661	7	REMOVED
662	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable because there will be loss of trees and hedgerows; loss of ecological habitats
662	2	There is already a density of houses in this area of Worksop encroaching on the countryside
662	3	Option A
663	1	Yes
663	2	Yes, we need more employment in the area
663	3	I think Gateford has had enough houses, find another site
663	4	I think location 35 is unsuitable. Keep the green area for walks
663	5	Not certain
663	6	Don't Know
663	7	I prefer that the proposed area (35) should be left for open spaces. Find another site.
663	8	No
663	9	Option A
663	10	REMOVED
663	11	REMOVED
664	1	I think site 35 is unsuitable
664	2	Option A
665	1	I believe the site/location 35 is not suitable for development because the current facilities in this area are not adequate for any extended population
665	2	The roads coming on and off the estate are presently only just adequate further traffic increase will take current traffic flow to breaking point
665	3	The impact on the environment with loss of green space is unacceptable to both the wildlife and residents of Worksop as there is plenty of brown sites laid to waste that could be utilised.
666	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
666	2	Option A
667	1	I think location 35 will put strain on the junction of Ashes Park Avenue with Gateford Road, and this must be rebalanced should location 35's planning consent be allowed. For example, the building of a road traffic island, or other such feature to ensure easy egress from Ashes Park Avenue during peak times. This junction is already busy
667	2	I welcome the planned protection of area 2/82 as green spaces.
667	3	Option A
668	1	Value of loss of agricultural land should not be viewed in only economic terms, but environmental terms where developments already exist, directly adjacent to, or bordered by agricultural land. By removing such areas will have more than an economic impact, but social/environmental impact for residents.
668	2	The Town should only have more housing allocations if there is evidential proof that the households populating the allocation will benefit the local economy. Without increasing tangible employment opportunities locally, those moving into new housing many remove money from the local economy. The only benefit is gained by the local Council in terms of increased Council Tax, something that local residents will not see a direct impact of. Therefore, I BELIEVE THAT Worksop CANNOT SUSTAIN 1,500 HOUSES.
668	3	4&W9;39&W10
668	4	The mixed purpose sites should be utilised as far as possible for employment and housing opportunities
668	5	Land 195 and adjacent mixed purpose sites have access to better infrastructure and are nearer to existing employment opportunities.
668	6	Yes, all proposed sites should remain protected.
668	7	Location 35 is unsuitable. This is because of the inadequate infrastructure on Ashes Park Avenue and Eddison Avenue to support traffic from 700 additional houses. There is already an issue at peak times on Ashes Park Avenue accessing Carlton Road and in particular, Gateford Road.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
668	8	The proposed site location 35 will create too many issues with infrastructure. Local amenities will need to be reviewed, such as GP, schooling, shopping - additionally, introducing 700 households with no amenities for young people 3-16 is unacceptable.
668	9	This has the potential to increase anti-social behaviour within the 8-16 age range; the area has had issues with this recently, including exclusion zones at Celtic Point and Gateford Road.
668	10	In addition, the disruption to surrounding houses from a new development will impact not only from an environmental perspective i.e. noise pollution, traffic pollution.
668	11	It will result in the loss of 70 hectares of agricultural land which is enjoyed by local people and is valued by residents on the estate, many of whom selected this area because of the access to the bridle paths and Owday Woods etc.. This development may result in people moving away from the area, many of whom are employed in the local area, this will have a knock on effect to the local economy which may not be filled by the influx of the new households with them being primarily to service Sheffield housing market.
668	12	Option A
669	1	No
669	2	I think location 35 is unsuitable for the following reasons; overshadowing, overlooking or loss of privacy
669	3	Traffic generation, access, road safety and parking provision
669	4	loss of trees and hedgerows
669	5	loss of ecological habitats or landscapes
669	6	Yes
669	7	Option A
669	8	Around existing sites - will save money
669	9	Together - will save money
670	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
670	2	Option A
671	1	I think location 35 is totally unsuitable
671	2	Option A
672	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable because it will increase traffic to an already over saturated part of the town. This will also make it unsafe for the many children in the area.
672	2	Option A
672	3	REMOVED
673	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
673	2	Option A
674	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
674	2	Option A
675	1	Only allocated more housing if on 'brown land' (i.e.: previous building land, factory land etc., NOT 'green land')
675	2	I think location 35 is unsuitable. The increased volume of traffic would be ridiculous. It is extremely difficult to get out onto Gateford Road at times now, without the addition of at least 700 more cars
675	3	It will have a detrimental effect on Owday and Whipman woods
675	4	increased pollution and reduced local house prices
675	5	Yes, all open spaces should be protected. There is enough land available for building that isn't open space
675	6	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
675	7	No, no new sites should be within the District. The local house prices would drop massively
675	8	Should be put together. Let the residential people have the hassle and upheaval of transit travellers coming and going
675	9	None
675	10	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35. This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
675	11	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
675	12	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
675	13	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
675	14	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
675	15	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
675	16	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
675	17	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
675	18	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
676	1	I consider that site 35 would be inappropriate for housing development for the following reasons: Additional traffic congestion on Ashes Park Avenue and junctions with Gateford Road and Carlton Road. Increased traffic on local roads which would access the new site - problems with young children on much busier roads
676	2	Loss of bridleways and green space
676	3	Strain on all local services
676	4	Option A
677	1	With regards to housing, there are over 800 empty properties within Bassetlaw which need to be brought back into occupation.
677	2	I think location 35 is totally unsuitable. The increase in traffic would cause huge problems, particularly when leaving Ashes Park Avenue to try to get onto Gateford Road, already causes problems. An additional 700 houses would cause more congestion.
677	3	Gateford is already densely populated
677	4	spoil an area of natural beauty with the loss of trees, hedgerows and wildlife.
677	5	I think the land off Blyth road is a more suitable option. It is creating employment as well as providing housing.
677	6	option A
678	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
678	2	The potential development will effect everyone significantly causing increased traffic jams exiting and entering the Ashes Park Estate, many more cars causing danger to our children
678	3	A strain on our schools and services
678	4	Worse traffic jams at local shops.
678	5	Construction road damage and years of mess, destruction of versatile and currently farmed agricultural land, destruction of beautiful countryside
678	6	Loss of bridleways/footpaths hedgerows, lost beautiful land which is frequently used by walkers daily.
678	7	Increased pollution
678	8	reduced local house prices.
678	9	the proposed development will detrimentally affect the view and privacy of current homeowners
678	10	Option A
679	1	Employment growth for sure, but not more housing, the area is full of new developments, some still not sold, by adding more jobs to the area then hopefully people will be able to purchase/rent properties that are standing empty.
679	2	I think location 35 is unsuitable due to the extra congestion it would cause, having lived here almost 10 years traffic has clearly increased during my time living here. I therefore think that adding more houses would be ridiculous to traffic, services, schooling allocations and more. I do NOT agree with this proposed site.
679	3	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
679	4	NONE.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
680	1	We agree that new business/employment/houses are needed in areas but feel the amount of housing you are planning within some areas are too much, as there are a lot of houses that are struggling to be sold and feel people can not afford to keep buying.
680	2	We strongly feel that 35 and 4 are unsuitable areas for housing development. There are a lot of people who get a lot of pleasure strolling, dog walking and biking within these areas and feel it would be an unnecessary loss to the countryside
680	3	We feel the open spaces identified on the map should be protected at all costs and free from any development proposals, whether housing or business.
680	4	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
681	1	i think location 35v is unsuitable, as the Gateford area is already overcrowded and this proposed development will have a detrimental effect on the whole area.
681	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
682	1	The screening methodology seems good but should include screening of the infrastructure, services already available and economic potential for income through council tax.
682	2	no
682	3	Location 35 is unsuitable due to points 2.6 4&5.
682	4	out of town areas
682	5	This would also have a large impact on green space and surrounding countryside including SINC close by
682	6	yes
682	7	Option B: Focused in just one of the above towns?
683	1	I consider site 35 to be unsuitable due to the issues with traffic congestion and lack of school provisions in the immediate area
683	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
684	1	Proposed location 35 is unsuitable for housing
684	2	The area is adjacent to the Owday plantation and Whipman wood which are both areas of outstanding natural beauty. Rare bird and insect life thrive in these woods and developing the land directly adjacent would be of serious detriment to this wildlife.
684	3	I must therefore put forward an absolute objection to the area 35 being utilised for housing development.
684	4	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
685	1	My comments are with regard to site 35 the land behind the Gateford nursing home. I cant understand why there is a need to build more houses, they are numerous for sale on both sides of the Gateford road that have been up for sale for ages, as is the case across Worksop
685	2	Currently the estates infrastructure just about copes with the number of residences living here more cars and more residents will only lead to more accidents particularly if the number of children increases
685	3	The local facilities which aren't really local cover a wide number of houses now and i doubt they will cope with much more demand.
685	4	A lack of facilities will mean that the children that move into the area will have nothing to do and therefore the number of youths hanging around the streets and causing trouble will increase. More houses will also create a labyrinth of roads and cul de sacs which will become easy pickings for burglars etc. The Gateford estates already suffer with vandalism and thefts from properties and vehicles this will only get worse.
685	5	The other point that needs to be understood there are other sites which could be developed that would not result in the destruction of fields, hedges and woodland, all homes to native wild life. Its vital that housing developments have a balance of urban and green and by building on the bit of countryside there is will greatly reduce the appeal of the area and that would mean more unsold potentially empty houses.
685	6	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
686	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
686	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
686	3	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
686	4	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
686	5	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
686	6	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
686	7	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
686	8	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
686	9	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
686	10	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
687	1	I believe site 35 is unsuitable for future development for the following reasons; traffic generation, access, road safety of cars and parking provision. There is already a problem with queues of car exiting the current site
687	2	Loss of trees or hedgerows - loss of habitats for rarer bird life, notably the Wood Pecker
687	3	Impact on public visual amenity - the area is extensibility used for leisure, from walkers, cyclists and a safe place for children to explore
687	4	Option A
688	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
688	2	Option A
689	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
689	2	Option A
690	1	I think that location 35 is unsuitable as the whole site is designated Green Belt
690	2	I commissioned a site survey as part of my house purchase in 2001, the survey showed that there is contaminated land on the North West corner of site 35 (mining and other industrial processes had taken place some years ago)
690	3	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
690	4	The private road that connects the Gateford Hill Nursing Home to Montford Road is used by the homes residents using their wheelchairs. There road is narrow with no provision of pavements. This development would make it dangerous to the residents and visitors alike.
690	5	The site is productive arable farmland which is used for growing Wheat, Barley, Potatoes and Oil Seed Rape.
690	6	The site is bisected by a Bridleway that connects Old Gateford Road through to Montford Road, then through site 35 to Owday Woods then forks to Woodsetts or Carlton In Lindrick.
690	7	The area has many beautiful old trees that line the bridleway and the Gateford Hill private road to the nursing home. These trees and the wildlife that use them would be destroyed if this site was approved
690	8	I am a keen bird watch and have recorded 34 native species including Tawny Owls. I have seen Bats in my area and installed a bat box some years ago in my garden.
690	9	The Gateford Park Primary school is already oversubscribed and many pupils have to be bussed to other schools. The site has no room to extend the school buildings so another school would have to be built
690	10	This development would make an already overloaded road system unsustainable, at present Ashes Park Avenue is gridlocked several times a day. The proposed development will add an estimated 600 plus car movements per day
691	1	more employment growth
691	2	no housing growth at the moment
691	3	I think the location 35 is unsuitable due to a lot of reasons mentioned in the significant criteria
691	4	It will cause traffic congestion in the local area
691	5	ruin countryside, affect agricultural land
691	6	will affect walkways and bridleways
691	7	will also strain on local amenities like school.
691	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
692	1	I think location 35 is totally unsuitable.
692	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
693	1	I am concerned that site 35 is proposed for further housing development. The proposed size of development seems excessive and would have a significant effect on already existing structures.
693	2	There is already a poor telecommunications service compared to many other areas.
693	3	The traffic congestion would increase to make it unsafe for current users and there is concern for the safety of elderly and local children that further increase in cars would bring.
693	4	The attractive environment that supports a wide variety of birdlife and which was a choice for us moving here would be spoilt.
693	5	There would be significant construction traffic and building work which would be intrusive and potentially damaging to the area.
693	6	The loss of 'space' and its impact on existing residents would be quite significant.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
693	7	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
694	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable for numerous reasons: namely that the current infrastructure is already under strain - exiting and entrance to Ashes park avenue is ridiculously busy.
694	2	Allocated places at local primary schools are over subscribed
694	3	there is currently no park or community centre for those dwellings which exist now not to mention a further 700!!
694	4	Yes i do
694	5	but i also think the proposed site development at 35 is currently farmed, agricultural land and cannot understand why this land is not protected after Gateford has taken up so much arable land already.
694	6	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
694	7	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
694	8	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
694	9	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
694	10	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
694	11	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
694	12	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
694	13	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
694	14	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
695	1	Yes
695	2	may offer the opportunity to provide funding for the restoration of Green Farm, which contains a significant listed building on the 'at risk' register and in a considerable state of disrepair. It may also allow for the re-use of historic buildings on the site which are currently underused/redundant.
695	3	However, any new development should be limited to a small number and confined to the existing hard surfaced area to the north.
695	4	Any housing should also be of a scale and design appropriate to the setting of historic buildings at Green Farm (and wider area) and use appropriate materials.
695	5	Site 221 (east of Doncaster Road, Langold) should provide an opportunity for industrial/commercial enterprise, either within the site or off-site in the vicinity.
695	6	The site could also provide an opportunity to utilise the former railway line as a community facility, perhaps linked under the road bridge to Langold Country Park.
695	7	A small part of site 520 (at its southern end) could be suitable provided the improvements to adjacent listed buildings are included and delivered.
695	8	Site 197 would also appear to be suitable as the site is hidden from view from the A60 and a large hedge divides the site from the field to the east. Accessibility may however be an issue.
695	9	Sites 174 and 176 are not suitable as development would cause significant harm to the character of Costhorpe, having open views eastwards, including towards Hodsock Priory and its historic parkland.
695	10	Agree with sites identified.
695	11	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
695	12	Should be concentrated within urban centres of Worksop, Retford and Harworth, close to local facilities and services.
695	13	This depends on the nature of the individual site, the nature of land ownership and the relationship between occupiers and land owners. Some sites are more suitable to long term use (where the quality of on-site services and facilities is high and site ownership is stable). Other sites are suitable only for transit (where few services are provided on site/nearby). Some sites may be suitable for both, particularly where on-site services are of a good standard and where the constant moving of vehicles would not impact on highway safety and local amenity.
695	14	I do not know of any sites in Carlton or Langold which would be suitable. Provision should be concentrated in the 3 main urban centres and close to main access routes.
696	1	yes
696	2	none
696	3	only on land west of A60

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
696	4	land east of A60 is grade 2 highly productive arable land
696	5	yes
696	6	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
696	7	REMOVED
696	8	i have no view
696	9	no
697	1	No
697	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
697	3	No, i believe the new development on the former detention centre is adequate for Gringley.
697	4	None
697	5	Yes, the recreation ground off Finkell street should be protected.
698	1	Yes
698	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
698	3	Yes for at least 15
698	4	165 would be the most suitable site.
698	5	Main Street floods and the school is full.
698	6	Existing sites should expand.
699	1	I have not seen it.
699	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
699	3	Yes I agree
699	4	410 should be redeveloped first.
699	5	Sites near to the main Retford Road should not be developed due to the increased traffic problems.
699	6	Yes, they should be preserved.
699	7	Yes, I think this should be developed first.
700	1	Yes
700	2	No
700	3	Site 35 is not suitable as this will create further pressure on an already struggling road network
700	4	It will also affect the local schools that are already full to bursting which will have an adverse effect on the education of our children.
700	5	I think that the potential protected land on ashes park avenue should become definitely protected as there is not much space for our children to play. This piece of land is where my children play and if this was not there then where would they go?
700	6	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
700	7	Definitely not.
700	8	REMOVED
700	9	None
701	1	I have serious concerns over the suitability of Location 35 shown on the map adjacent to the Gateford estate.
701	2	The estate already struggles at peak times with traffic from Ashes Park Avenue onto Gateford Road, the addition of more houses and by implication vehicles would impact heavily on congestion and, more importantly on safety as more cars attempt to join Gateford Road in the short Kingfisher Walk, Ashes Park Avenue, Lady Walk section of the road.
701	3	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
702	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable, as it will infringe on a conservation area
702	2	and destroy some mature trees, of special values.
702	3	There are numerous species of significant value living within these fields. Deer, squirrels, pheasants, field mice, moles, badgers and foxes are all seen on a regular basis. Are there going to be patches of open space left to make up for the destruction of the wildlife habitats that will be destroyed. I doubt it.
702	4	Traffic lights will be needed at the exits of the estate and already it is chaos on the Celtic point shopping park, with car accidents occurring on a regular basis.
702	5	The local schools are at full capacity.
702	6	The fields are used by people for running, walking and relaxing in.
702	7	The economic, environmental, social effects of the proposed housing are too detrimental for the housing to go ahead.
702	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
702	9	I wish to object strongly to the development of any houses at site 35 based on the below reasons: The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. Any increase in housing on the estate will make this situation intolerable and dangerous to residents and visitors.
702	10	Increased traffic levels on the estate generally reducing the quality of our environment, increasing noise levels, pollution and increasing danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
702	11	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape.
702	12	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
702	13	The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
702	14	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment.
702	15	This bridleway is used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users. The loss of this countryside would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Plantation.
702	16	Our local shops which are sited off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, especially as one of the shops became an ASDA. Additional housing will cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas.
702	17	Our local schools (primary, secondary and school based nurseries) are already at capacity.
702	18	No
703	1	I believe location 35 is unsuitable for housing development due to inadequate infrastructure, traffic congestion
703	2	Loss of trees and hedgerows
703	3	The impact upon public visual amenity
703	4	Option A
703	5	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
703	6	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
703	7	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
703	8	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area.
703	9	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape.
703	10	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
704	1	As you will be aware from our consultation responses to the emerging Bassetlaw Core Strategy, the Bassetlaw area has been subject to past deep coal mining activity, which has left a limited legacy, primarily of mine entries (shafts and adits) and fissures (areas of geological weakness).
704	2	I have reviewed the various potential site allocations identified as part of this consultation against our coal mining information. Of the potential allocations, I would draw your attention to the presence of recorded mine entries within Opportunity Site 153/587 at Shireoaks, and request that the presence of mine entries and the need to ensure the land is made safe and stable for development is highlighted within any site description or list of identified constraints.
704	3	Whilst there are a number of recorded fissures within the settlement of Elkesley, none of the potential site allocations appear to intersect these features.
704	4	You will also be aware of the presence of mine entries within an area of committed employment at Harworth
704	5	You will also be aware of an area of committed housing at Carlton-in-Lindrick.
705	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
705	2	35
705	3	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
706	1	With regard to consultation re. new housing proposals as set out in the Bassetlaw LDF, I am totally opposed to any development, housing or otherwise, of land between Gateford and Carlton, or on Kilton Hill surrounding the golf course. These areas should remain green open space.
707	1	Retford is a lovely market town, surrounded by many areas of unspoilt beauty. All around the proposed areas you intent to develop are good people who care about others, it would alter the whole character of the area and the very heart of the surrounding landscape and the hearts of the people who live here

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
707	2	I a writing to voice my concerns over the recent proposed housing development I and around the Durham Grove area, which I may add as a resident here since 1986- has never lost its charm and rural feel, yet only a few minutes walk into town or country lanes. Therefore I am somewhat disturbed and concerned as to the sheer numbers of possible houses you intend to build, also that none of us residing in and around the proposed sites were consulted
707	3	Development would result in loss of agricultural land
707	4	Development would cause even more traffic congestion, which is bad enough in term time at Carr hill and an increasing amount of heavy traffic choosing Tiln Lane route as opposed to Welham Bridge
707	5	The present road infrastructure is just not suitable for further residential development
707	6	I continue to ask why it is necessary to build outside the existing development envelope, when there are brownfield sites available for development. Surely this should be utilised before using the edge of town and beyond the borough boundary as seems to be the case, if this development was to be passed
707	7	I would like to mention some valid planning objections that no doubt many residents like myself have grave concerns about a) road access. b) loss of trees- altering the beauty of the area and habitat for nature. c) loss of light and/or overshadowing to people's properties d) highway safety e) sheer volume of traffic f) loss of privacy
707	8	Loss of light and overshadowing nearby properties.
707	9	Highway Safety
707	10	Sheer volume of traffic
707	11	Loss of privacy
707	12	I am aware that there is a meeting concerning the proposals that I hope I can attend. Retford is a lovely market town, surrounded by many areas of unspoilt beauty, all around the proposed areas you intend to develop are good and people who care about others, it would alter the whole character of the area and the very heart of the surrounding landscape and the hearts of the people who live here.
708	1	I wish to issue a strong protest to your proposal housing development in my area
708	2	The school does not have enough capacity for more children
708	3	The road i.e. Tiln Lane is just a death trap already with all the vehicles using it to avoid Welham Road
708	4	We are a brownfield site what on earth are you doing. The area is a proven flood plain. The last development Shetland, left us with gardens that flood due to ditches been filled in and the council riding rough shod over planning permission given and leaving us in the lurch with developer who did not care
708	5	The area is such that the road would be constantly congested and the pollution unbearable
708	6	The loss of trees and green fields in only one aspect
708	7	Retford has so much new housing that no one seems to want to buy
708	8	You are aiming to make us just another urban sprawl. We are a nice country town with plenty of green fields and open spaces. Please listen to the people that live in this area. Do not destroy what we have go by building just another unwanted housing state. Think about the impact it would have on he environment, the local school, roads, residents and the town
709	1	My husband and I wish to object to the proposed housing development on land to the north of Retford, numbered on the map, 533, and most particularly 7 (known as Longholme Farm), as set out in the Local Development Framework -Site Allocations document
709	2	Retford is at present a small market town rapidly becoming a dormitory for those either living here and working elsewhere or for those without employment
709	3	More housing would not bring much needed employment but would merely flood the area with cars
709	4	the town shops are predominantly small, those in the larger properties very much at the cheap end and people are forced to leave the town to shop in Sheffield, Doncaster or Lincoln thus spending elsewhere.
709	5	Development of 7 in particular would destroy the local character which is of countryside stretching to the various villages to the north and east
709	6	It would mean the destruction of hedges, trees and dykes.
709	7	This would lead to a consequent loss of wild life.
709	8	There are public footpaths crossing the land which are in constant use by dog walkers, healthy walking groups and individuals.
709	9	There is a particular issue regarding road safety. The second part of Bigsby Road (that part leading to (7)) is relatively wide until cars are parked on both sides which happens between 6pm and 6am. Due to the dip in the road down to Longholme Farm (7) cars leaving from the new development would have serious sight issues. In addition, the junction of Bigsby Road and Park Lane is already one which is causing safety and anger issues. In order to leave Bigsby Road people choose whether to turn onto Park Lane or continue down a slightly narrowed Bigsby Road towards Tiln Lane. This narrowed part already has its problems with cars attempting to pass each other and the exit onto Tiln Lane has to be taken carefully.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
709	10	This brings me to the issue of road safety in the Tiln Lane area. There is a large primary school with the usual issues of cars and buses at School time, plus the school crossing wardens having to stop traffic. Traffic coming from the Clarbrough area drive far too fast despite the 30mph and speed monitor warnings, the addition of more houses being build in the area (Nos. 37 and 512) would exacerbate the problem, and the idea of a possible recreation ground (no 1/61) next to Tiln Lane is appalling.
709	11	The same but different issue with traffic on Tiln Lane is that coming Moorgate. The alternative route to Gainsborough and Lincolnshire in general is the Tiln Lane route and has to be used by large lorries. The exit from Moorgate is very confined with cars parked on one side, occasionally to leave Bigsby Road are prevented by those already queuing on Tiln Lane, add extra cars from any new development and a bad situation is made much worse.
710	1	Until such time as the present economical climate has been rectified, and mortgage finance made easily available again, I see no point in greatly increasing the housing stock, for it then to stand empty (as is very much the case in Spain at present).
710	2	With regard to the proposed siting of new houses, as many of Worksop's population work in Sheffield, as I did prior to retirement, it would seem logical to concentrate on the Gateford area and other sites close to the A57.
710	3	The potential housing site close to our property (site reference 9) would certainly produce even greater traffic problems than we already encounter- it is already a nightmare trying to access Mansfield Road (A60) or the Mill House roundabout from either end of St. Anne's Drive.
710	4	We, along with our neighbours, who are all pensioners and retired, bought our properties principally because of the proximity to green, open space and would hate to see this destroyed
711	1	It is in the interest of us all to preserve and take care of our countryside. Building houses on green fields when there are brown fields scattered in and around Worksop waiting for development, is in my opinion close to being a criminal act.
711	2	Once these beautiful green fields on the Osberton estate where I and my mother and father walked for many, many years has been dug up that beautiful scenery we still enjoy today will be gone forever.
711	3	The building on green fields has to stop, the land belongs to the people of our country not land owners who had it given to them by some queen or king of days past, we have the right to say who builds what and where on our land not a council, it us the tenants and residents of the area who will be staring at bricks and mortar from our windows and not the lovely cultivated fields that the local farmer who provides this for us.
712	1	Having examined the site allocation plan figure 5.1, I am most concerned about the areas numbered 511, 370 and 3 on the map of Retford's potential development sites and open spaces. I think these areas should be protected from any future development for the following reasons
712	2	We are at an increased risk of flooding if building is to take place in these areas. Our properties are already subject to a lot of standing water after rain, which is very slow to soak away due to the land having a very high clay content. This is further exaggerated by the fact our surface water does not soak into local sewers but into 'soak always
712	3	Traffic congestion on Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane into London Road, This is already a problem at certain times of the day and with a great increase in traffic from potentially 521 properties this situation would become extremely difficult.
713	1	Yes, we agree with the criteria
713	2	Option A
713	3	Bearing in mind the developments completed in the past few years and approved development awaiting completion, we think a maximum of six is acceptable
713	4	In order of preference, sites 101 and 106 are the only ones we feel should be developed
713	5	Development of nay other sites would spoil the character and openness of the village, which has already been affected by recent developments in the village
713	6	Site 106 had adequate room for a public house and a maximum of 6 houses
713	7	However, we feel it would be preferable to build the public house on the site originally proposed which we understand was adjacent to the village hall
713	8	Nothing springs to mind
713	9	We agree wholeheartly with the quality and value of open spaces in the District. Consequently, we agree that the open spaces identified on the map should be protected form any future development proposals
713	10	We think site 496 should be protected too, in case the cemetery/burial ground needs to be extended at a later date.
713	11	We think any new gyps and traveller sites should be concentrated n and around existing sites within the District t reserve their community
713	12	We think these should be provided together as the infrastructure/facilities would already be there for them all to use
713	13	Not aware of any
714	1	We are writing to comment on the above, as part of the consultation process which ends on 31/0112. We would like to strongly object to the inclusion of the above sites in the Local Development Framework as being 'developable'. We understand that if passed for future development the in question would allow for 628 houses, with a potential 5 year build rate (site 5 11)
714	2	The sites in question would, if developed, totally destroy the character of the area where we live, completely surrounding the appropriately scaled estate of established properties which now exists. Our objections concern the following planning issues which, we understand, can legitimately be considered according to your published guidance

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
714	3	Traffic generation, access, road safety and parking provision. Even if roads in the area were widened etc. as the S.H.L.A.A. (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2011) suggests the additional number of vehicles (500?) would create significant road safety and congestion issues particularly entering London Road. So many more noisy and polluting vehicles would also adversely affect the 'liveability' of the area.
714	4	Inadequate infrastructure to support the development. Everyone we speak to in Retford cannot understand the need for so many new homes when properties stand empty and there is no evidence of any significant new employment opportunities. There has already been extensive house building in Retford in recent years. The local primary school is at capacity, enlarging it would detract from its amenities, and exacerbate an already awful parking problem at 'drop off times.
714	5	Flood risk. Due to its location (at the bottom of hills and sloping terrain) the area can be subject to flooding. Building on these greenfield sites would exacerbate the problem significantly, blocking the natural absorption of the fields in question
714	6	Loss of trees and hedgerows. The hedgerows surrounding the fields in question are home to many species of birds, which are a significant source of pleasure to local residents
714	7	Loss of ecological habitats or landscapes. The pleasant open green nature of the sites in question would be lost if developed. Currently many local residents enjoy walking along the lanes adjacent to sites 511 and 370. Losing these fields would be to the detriment of the 'liveability' of the area, having the opposite effect of 'improving attractiveness to local residents' and 'promoting physical and mental well-being' -see Bassetlaw Local Planning Policy
714	8	Design, appearance, layout, density and mass of building. The number of housing units suggested for these sites (particularly 511 having 158 units) seems far too dense to be anything but ugly.
714	9	Impact on listed buildings and / or Conservation Areas. The sites would impact on the local Conservation area
714	10	farmers fields which would be lost to valuable and productive agriculture, in a country where space is limited
714	11	Impact on public visual amenity. Developing these sites would have a significant detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area. In the S.H.L.A.A. your assessment wrongly states (on more than one occasion - see e.g. site 370) that 'the site is within the wider residential area'. In fact the sites are not 'within' a residential area but are the start of completely open countryside! To develop these sites would change an agreeable area in harmony with its surroundings into one surrounded by densely packed dwellings significantly affecting the quality of the lived environment
715	1	Trusting you will take these concerns into consideration when deciding on sites for future housing development in Retford
715	2	The western section of site 3, adjoining London Road could be classified as infill
715	3	The area west of London Road, east of Whitehouse's Road, adjacent to the railway line should not be excluded from development as it is already has a brick building with water connected and access to the main road. It has potential for development for agricultural or residential use
716	1	As residents of Palmer Road, we object in the strongest possible terms to the council plans to develop land (ref: 533, 7, 46 & 309) on the grounds of: a) no consultation with residents prior to the production of the proposal
716	2	the development will completely alter the character of the area
716	3	loss of habitat for wildlife, birds of prey, deer foxes, rabbits, pheasant, partridge and many other small birds. Presently a neighbour who is ringing secretary of North Nott's Ringing Group. Ringed a swallow in his garden adjacent to plot 7. The swallow travelled 11,000 miles to umzumbe barn swallow roost site is South Africa, where it is recorded as being recaptured
716	4	Loss of trees, willow which is harvested and many other trees which surround the site.
716	5	Loss of good agricultural land
716	6	This is a quite residential area the development will completely alter the character of the area and destroy the peaceful area where we all enjoy living
716	7	There will be a huge increase of traffic. Tiln Lane is an already busy road, lorries have to use this road to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Tiln Lane would be turned into an access road into the proposed development massively increasing the traffic
716	8	Traffic would also increase to dangerously high levels along Palmer Road, into Cornwall Road onto Bigsby Road or Park Lane and Longholme Road to Welham Road to avoid the busy Tiln Lane
716	9	The junction from Tiln Road onto Moorgate is already extremely hazardous. This development would cause huge traffic increase with traffic queuing from Moorgate to get into Tiln Lane, creating even more danger
716	10	The danger to road users and pedestrians would be immense
716	11	The already stretched services, fire, police, hospitals, GP services would not be able to cope. The funding needed to increase these services would be massive
716	12	The proposed area involves building outside the development envelope. The proposal involves building outside the borough boundary.
716	13	All brownfield sites should be developed for housing, before developing the edge of town and beyond the borough boundary
717	1	I wish to object to the future development proposals that are being considered for the area surrounding Bracken Lane. As a resident living in the area for forty five years, I am aware more than anyone, of the problems that this development would bring.
717	2	There has been a succession of problems in the area due to the heavy clay nature and layout of the land all caused by flooding from Grove Hills and the decline of the roads towards the beck in the present built up area.
717	3	There is also the issue of the inability of the present roads to cope with traffic density.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
717	4	Cars are parked nose to tail down Bracken Lane and Rose Avenue during part of the day
717	5	At other times, it is extremely difficult to gain access to London Road and Coach Road, additional housing in the area will make access significantly worse.
718	1	No more above the number required . Retford is well known as a small market town (which is its attraction). This should not change
718	2	It would seem logical to extend the existing residential development with sites 51 and 58 as these are very accessible and would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area (so long as the site does not extend too far out of town, the Randall Way junction would seem sensible).
718	3	has good links to the highway network, especially now the roundabout has been constructed
718	4	Sites 3, 370 and 511 would not be significantly visually intrusive. Question 11 R7
718	5	R7
718	6	R7
718	7	I have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41 , 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons
718	8	I have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41 , 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons
718	9	In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goose moor Lane. The bridge on Goose moor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near the bridge. The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road I Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times. Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses
718	10	Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside
718	11	Yes in principle
718	12	Yes, the village needs to grow slightly in order to support the school, shops etc. New housing should be smaller (and more affordable) than the new houses recently built on Station Road
718	13	Site 156 as this will not be particularly intrusive, subject to improvements to pedestrian facilities along Folly Nook Lane.
719	1	No more above the number required. Retford is well known as a small market town (which is its attraction). This should not change
719	2	It would seem logical to extend the existing residential development with sites 51 and 58 as these are very accessible and would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area (so long as the site does not extend too far out of town, the Randall Way junction would seem sensible).
719	3	Site 27 has good links to the highway network, especially now the roundabout has been constructed
719	4	Sites 3, 370 and 511 would not be significantly visually intrusive
719	5	R7
719	6	R7
719	7	I have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41 , 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons
719	8	In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goose moor Lane. The bridge on Goose moor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near the bridge The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows. Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road I Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times. Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A 1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
719	9	Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
719	10	Yes in principle
719	11	Yes, the village needs to grow slightly in order to support the school, shops etc. New housing should be smaller (and more affordable) than the new houses recently built on Station Road.
719	12	Site 156 as this will not be particularly intrusive, subject to improvements to pedestrian facilities along Folly Nook Lane.
719	13	Yes
719	14	The proposed Sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife –including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed. feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested
719	15	The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathletes etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the
719	16	For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
719	17	Up to opposite Randall Way junction. Accessible and sensible 'rounding off'.
719	18	Limited extension along Tiln Lane, very accessible, good links to town centre.
719	19	Ready made for development! Excellent access.
719	20	Former/existing garage depot? More suited to housing.
719	21	Industrial site located in (now) residential area. Better to have housing on here (amenity, vehicles etc.).
719	22	Excellent access to highway network, would not be visually intrusive.
720	1	It was only by gossip that we learned of the proposed development beyond Bigsby Road, although the killing off of the willow should have been a sign that something subversive was afoot
720	2	Prior to the planting of the willow the land was used for crops and grazing affording ideal conditions to sustain wildlife such as hares, rabbits, foxes, deer and bats along with bird life such as owls, pheasants and partridges together with numerous other species of British birds. To build on this rural landscape would be of significant damage to the environment
720	3	Until an alternative road is constructed to bypass Welham Bridge it would be ludicrous to build up to 1000 houses adjacent to Tiln Lane and The Smeath as this is the only route available to HGVs and high sided vehicles
720	4	Tiln Lane is already congested owing to the number of children being ferried to and from Carr Hill School by car and bus. It must be a nightmare for drivers trying to squeeze between cars parked on either side of the road. Considering most households have at least one car the consequent chaos can be imagined
720	5	Present primary schools could not cope with the extra pupils such a development would involve. I doubt whether the N.H.S. could cope with such numbers either
720	6	We have not been informed as to the type of housing proposed, but as Retford appears to be dying from lack of industries, a plethora of charity and cheapjack shops, one can only presume social housing is envisaged as numerous houses are presently for sale, some having been on the market for months.
721	1	yes
721	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
721	3	yes, for at least 5 new homes
721	4	410 would be my preferred site, although 412 is an alternative
721	5	I agree that the open spaces should be protected
721	6	Yes, the site is currently lying vacant and already causing concern among some residents. I agree that some housing may be a benefit in redeveloping the site.
721	7	Existing sites.
721	8	Together.
722	1	The area in question is outside the Worksop boundary and would constitute a 'urban/rural creep'
722	2	The area is prime farmland and the development would reduce much needed food production.
722	3	Loss of jobs. As prime farmland, it supports employment for agricultural workers.
722	4	Loss of ecological habitat for existing wildlife.
722	5	Loss of landscape for existing residents of the area.
722	6	Loss of trees at Nab's Ashes Wood.
722	7	Cutting a road (potential access) through an existing potential protected open space, splitting it in two.
722	8	Increased pedestrian hazard as a result of the above point.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
722	9	Inadequate infrastructure to support the development that would result in increased traffic generation by potential new residents having to travel to necessary/essential facilities; increased vehicle pollution.
723	1	I am opposed to any development on the land between Gateford and Carlton-in-Lindrick. This agricultural land has two rights of way across it which are well used and enjoyed by walkers, cyclists and horse riders.
723	2	The land should remain as a green open space.
724	1	Location/Site 35 is seriously NOT suitable. The local schools and roads are already at capacity so this site would push the local facilities too far!
724	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
725	1	Yes
725	2	Sites 79, 80, 86, 91,92,93, 201, 202, 498, 499, 564
725	3	We do not believe Site 87 should be a mixed site at all.
725	4	There are transport issues coming from grove wood road and fox covert with low bridges. We are already having problems with lorries hitting these.
725	5	We do not consider it suitable to have industrial units next to the school area which is protected open space and we already have an underused industrial estate on Stockwith Lane.
725	6	We are unhappy with allocation at site 481 when this is total open space and not in our opinion suitable for housing.
725	7	We do not consider sites 89 and 88 are suitable for housing. They are very close to the canal and are poor sighted in respect of exiting the village.
725	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
725	9	Existing sites as if there are already sites available which could be expanded this causes less concern than establishing new areas.
725	10	Separately if possible as we would have thought this was more considerate to those who are resident.
726	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
726	2	yes I agree
726	3	site 428 is the best site
726	4	yes the play area and school should be protected
726	5	existing sites
727	1	The screening methodology criteria appear satisfactory.
727	2	The suggested allocation of housing and employment growth goes beyond that which the PC feels is needed within the area. Worksop (incl. Shireoaks and Rhodesia) should not take on allocations not fulfilled by other rural service centres. This has been reflected in the questionnaires completed by residents in 2011.
727	3	The PC would prefer to see smaller infill sites utilised rather than very large developments (use of indicated sites with 40 or less allocated housing would yield around 245) as these would have more impact on a particular area and their infrastructure including traffic problems. This also reflects the views of 90% of residents who indicated that brownfield sites should be developed before greenfield and also 36% would only like to see up to 50 urban extensions of up to 50 houses. Para 4.1 in the BDC I&O SA doc has already identified known infrastructure problems, including ... congestion along the A57 corridor and lack of primary school capacity, clearly therefore considerable work would be needed to increase traffic capacity on sites which rely on the single carriageway sections of this road.
727	4	Sites 218 and 151 are within Shireoaks and residents have indicated their reluctance to permit further development due to concerns regarding infrastructure, traffic issues, insufficient school places and lack of surgery facilities.
727	5	However, it is felt that these two sites have an existing small settlement and therefore the impact would be minimal, although it is essential that Coach Wood, southwest of site 218 and the existing mature trees on the whole site must be preserved. In view of this, the design, density and housing mix ought to be carefully considered to ensure it conforms with Policy DM5 with reference to local character.
727	6	Site 9 would be a much larger development but would increase an existing area and it is felt that further housing would mean that additional facilities such as surgeries, schools and shops could be introduced as part of the estate.
727	7	Site 35 - This is an extension of an existing estate and it would give further possibility for an increase in services. The agricultural land is not grade 1 and drainage should be adequate.
727	8	Site 561 - The exit road from this site would mean that access to Shireoaks Road would be close to the level crossing. The possibility of extending the car park opposite this access was opposed by highways officials when it was proposed a couple of years ago. The entrance to the proposed development site could not be widened to accommodate vehicles due to the proximity of the railway line on one side and the canal on the other. it is therefore not felt to be practical for future housing.
727	9	Sites 45 and 371 would have an unacceptable impact on traffic generation, loss of trees and hedgerows and would have an adverse effect on the infrastructure of the village of Shireoaks.
727	10	Residents of new houses in this area would be affected by traffic noise from the A57. It would contravene Policy DM4 with regard to scale being inappropriate to the existing settlement and surrounding area.
727	11	Existing houses on the outskirts of the village adjoining these areas are detached properties, mainly bungalows, standing in large gardens giving a spacious character and in the event of an application being considered, then design would need to reflect this.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
727	12	The BDC LCA advises the creation of small scale woodland and tree planting to contain and soften industrial development adjacent to the railway and A57 and potential development within the Policy Zone to create new hedgerows. Housing development would clearly go against this assessment of the area.
727	13	There has been expansion of employment opportunities in recent years in the environs of Worksop e.g. Manton Wood, Shireoakes Triangle, Claylands Industrial Estate. All these areas appear to have further capacity and many buildings remain empty.
727	14	The old Vesuvius site will attract further employment and therefore it is felt that existing areas should be the focus of any extensions over the next 17 years. (It would appear that the Vesuvius site and that of the proposed new supermarket at Kilton are not printed on the maps supplied).
727	15	The PC feel that, due to the current recession, more business will probably vacate existing developments giving the opportunity for further refurbishment and development without utilising new sites.
727	16	55% of Shireoaks residents would prefer to see existing sites redeveloped with 37% indicating that small extensions would be preferable.
727	17	Site W12 backs on to an existing enterprise zone with access to the A1 from two sides.
727	18	Site W1 however, has not had any previous development and adjoins a green space area which should be preserved and not developed.
727	19	W13 area should be reduced to the north of the indicated area to avoid unnecessary impact on the canal and towpath which is an important recreation thoroughfare for walkers, cyclists and wildlife.
727	20	Site 4/W9 Option 3 is identified as a mixed use development site. Building housing in close proximity to possible employment opportunities could help reduce the need for commuting and therefore be more beneficial ecologically.
727	21	The area has good access to the A1 link.
727	22	The site area indicated should however be reduced from that recommended.
727	23	The recreation area and golf course should be preserved as important open spaces.
727	24	39 & W10 - development of this site in addition to 4/W9 would have too much impact on the area, the option should be one or the other. There would however be an impact on the residents of the existing estate and the mixture of housing and employment facilities should be done in a sympathetic manner in line with CS Policy DM4.
727	25	195/343/W8 is a greenfield site of good agricultural land adjacent to a number of sensitive countryside areas.
727	26	Site access would be on to a single carriageway section of the A57 which has already been identified in the plan as a source of congestion.
727	27	This area has also caused drainage problems as water currently runs off this land down to the village and floods some gardens on Shireoaks Common. These were particularly severe in 2007 - ref. DM12). Similar objections were raised at the time of the application for the North/Bovis development which were not upheld but have since been proven.
727	28	A number of these houses are also still empty and it has still not been adopted by the District Council.
727	29	A development of the size proposed would far exceed the natural growth expected of a village (Policy ref DM4 Aiii). Residents have confirmed that they would like to see village life and feel to be preserved (50% of those who completed the questionnaire specifically highlighted this).
727	30	it is vital that all open space sites identified should be protected. In Shireoaks the area known as Woodlands and the Marina site are recommended to be assigned as green open space areas.
727	31	In order to preserve the identity of the village of Shireoaks there should be substantial greenfield spaces around the village and between Rhodesia and other developments which are threatening to encroach from Worksop.
727	32	183/587 This is a unique area, not just in Shireoaks and Worksop but certainly within the county and perhaps even the country. It is a former industrial site with a rich history surrounding it. It is also adjacent to the Chesterfield Canal and surrounded by open space. Any use of the land would need to take these factors into consideration. Insensitive housing development would let it be destroyed and all opportunities to develop this unique landscape would be lost.
727	33	The recent questionnaire indicated that no residents wanted to see the whole area built on but some would like to see very limited housing and that the majority preferred the site to be used for recreational amenities, to encourage wildlife and other facilities to attract visitors.
727	34	The PC would support residents views on its future and particularly the initial draft outline design brief attached (originally compiled by John Palmer in 2010/11) but would urge the District and County Councils to consult the PC and residents on any future plans. It is the PC's intention to investigate the possibility of producing a neighbourhood plan for the village.
727	35	Within the yellow area highlighted on the SA map the OC would consider the 3 areas which are planted as woodland as vital to be maintained and that they be allocated as an open space site, not as an opportunity site.
727	36	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
727	37	Existing sites should be utilised
727	38	Transit and residential pitches should be provided separately as they accommodate travellers of different cultures.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
728	1	<p>1.1. CgMs has been instructed by Wild goose Construction to prepare representations to promote the allocation of the site known as land north of Station Road, Beckingham for residential development. We have previously submitted such representations to the Bassetlaw Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). Having now considered the planning authority's Site Allocations Issues and Options document we welcome the inclusion of the site (ref: 106) as a potential housing site and now submit the following report to the planning authority for its consideration in the subsequent preparation of the subsequent Site Allocations Preferred Options document. 1.2. Wild goose Construction has selected the site because of its sustainability credentials and the attractive character and appearance of the existing village. The company envisages a high quality, well-connected and well-balanced residential development, which will contribute positively to the settlement's established character, and make the most of the site's physical context in the centre of the village. Such a development in this location will constitute a highly sustainable solution towards meeting the adopted Core Strategy's objectives. 1.3. Wild goose Construction Ltd is a leading Building Contractor operating throughout a wide geographical area centring on Yorkshire and the East and West Midlands, with a reputation for quality and client satisfaction. 1.4. The Company has a non-adversarial approach and a focus on attention to detail. These attributes have enabled Wild goose Construction to maintain a reputation for unrivalled customer service and quality. The extent of repeat work carried out for its clients illustrates its success. 1.5. The company's development and house building arm, Wild goose Homes, undertakes speculative developments throughout the region with notable projects in both Sheffield and Chesterfield. The company do not utilise standard house types and all units are of a bespoke design tailored to suit the individual merits of a site. The company have been awarded various commendations for their achievements in both the design and delivery of residential and commercial developments. The company is committed to the environmental aspects of new buildings, notably the Code for Sustainable Homes. All new developments meet at least Code Level 3 by incorporating various features to assist in energy efficiency such as improved insulation and photovoltaic panels. The company aims to improve on Building Regulations requirements. 1.6. Wild goose Construction and its subsidiaries is a privately owned concern which was established in 1896 by the great grandfather of the present Chairman, Mr Jonathan Wild goose. It is a registered member of the National House Building Council (NHBC) and an ISO 9001 and 14001 Registered Firm. The company is also a member of the Investors In People scheme. The turnover for the financial year ending in 2008 was in excess of £38,000,000.</p>
728	2	<p>3.1. We recognise that Policy CS8 of the adopted Core Strategy establishes that the 20 identified Rural Service Centres (including Beckingham) could share <i>up to</i> 10% of the District's total housing requirement 2010 to 2028. This equates to 770 dwellings over the plan period, but allowing for current planning commitments and readily deliverable sites, the residual requirement is 328 dwellings. 3.2. We understand that the intention is that if less than 10% of the housing requirement is ultimately met in the Rural Service Centres, then the residual requirement to meet the District's total needs will be reapportioned to the larger settlements of Worksop, Retford or Harworth-Bircotes. 3.3. While we accept that the above flexible approach is supported by recently adopted policy embodied in the Core Strategy, we consider that the Site Allocations process should so far as is possible seek to meet the targets for the proportional split of residential development set out in Table 4.1 of the adopted Core Strategy. Any significant variation from such a split will not ensure a sustainable settlement hierarchy. The need to maintain the sustainability of rural settlements, by the appropriate allocation of development in such locations is considered to be particularly important and is in accordance with national policy contained with PPS3: Housing (paragraph 28). 3.4. In accordance with PPS3, the identification of locations for development should be based on the analysis of a range of material planning considerations, which amongst others include: demand and need; the potential contribution to cutting carbon emissions (focussing development in locations with good public transport); constraints and risks associated with broad locations and specific sites; accessibility to existing community facilities. Such an objective approach should apply to development in both urban and rural locations. 3.5. Thus, the level of development in each of the Rural Service Centres, and the choice of specific sites, should depend on a range of criteria relating to sustainability and suitability. In determining the capacity of each settlement to take further development, we consider that in addition to the availability of local services, particular consideration should also be given to relative proximity and connectivity to higher-order centres which provide more major services. The subject site at Station Road, Beckingham is less than 6km from the nearest town Gainsborough, which can be accessed by regular public transport services. 3.6. It is considered that while the planning authority proposes a logical and objective approach to screening potential sites in the preparation of the subsequent Preferred Options document, to date it has not taken an objective approach to identifying the amount of development that may be suitable in each of the Rural Service Centres.</p>
728	3	<p>3.7. It is understood that a resident's survey was undertaken in each Rural Service Centre which asked for views on the level of housing development that should be provided for. This has not proved to be an objective way of measuring actual demand or need. In the case of Beckingham, out of 486 questionnaires, only 90 responses were received – giving a response rate of 18.52%. It is considered that such a low response cannot be considered as statistically significant. Furthermore, the most common response was “no new housing”. If this was regarded as the most significant factor, then the conclusion would be that there should be no new housing in Beckingham, despite the fact that it is a highly sustainable location for new residential development. 3.8. Although the planning authority has acknowledged that the mean level of residential development considered appropriate by survey respondents was 6.5 houses, we do not consider that such a figure should be regarded as being of significance for land-use planning as it is purely a statistical average derived from the responses received. It is not grounded in material planning considerations relating to the sustainability of the settlement as a whole, or the availability of suitable sites. Nor is it based on a representative sample of residents' views.</p>
728	4	<p>3.9. We also note that the survey-driven approach to the apportionment of development is also problematic in that when the survey results for the 20 Rural Service Centres are considered as a whole, there is a shortfall of 3% relative to the identified Core Strategy target for residential development in the Rural Service Centres. The suggestion that this requirement may be redistributed to the three largest settlements, as stated in the Site Allocations Issues and Options document, may not only result in environmental degradation in the affected larger settlements (Worksop, Retford and Harworth / Bircotes), but it could also contribute to the social and economic decline of the affected Rural Service Centres.</p>

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
728	5	3.10. It should also be noted that the draft National Planning Policy Framework advocates that local authorities should allocate at least a further 20% over the strategic target in order to promote choice: “To boost the supply of housing, local planning authorities should: identify and maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements. The supply should include an additional allowance of at least 20 per cent to ensure choice and competition in the market for land.” (para 109).
728	6	3.11. We would suggest that the determination of how much development may be appropriate must be based on material planning considerations and should be strongly influenced by the potential of available suitable sites. While the overriding aim should be to achieve 10% of all residential development in the 20 Rural Service Centres as a whole, we consider that some individual settlements with particularly strong sustainability credentials (like Beckingham), and highly suitable sites (as proposed) may take more than an equal share of the residual requirement i.e. more than one-twentieth of the residual requirement of 328 dwellings (16.4 dwellings).
728	7	3.12. While the proposed “Stage Two” site assessment criteria appropriately include the question of compatibility with neighbouring land uses, and impact on built character, we consider that in the interests of sound spatial planning, they should be broadened also to refer explicitly to relationship to settlement form and urban design considerations. In that respect, we consider that in estimating the potential development capacity of individual settlements, due regard should be had for well contained sites which sit within or immediately adjacent to the existing settlement envelopes, and particularly those that have the potential to improve the existing built form of the settlement. Such is the case with the subject site, north of Station Road, Beckingham.
728	8	4.1. As a larger village of over 1,200 residents Beckingham itself is a highly sustainable location for development. It includes a village shop and post office, a primary school, village hall, playing fields and a sports and social club. The town of Gainsborough, Lincolnshire is accessible within approximately 15 minutes by bus, and between mornings and evenings on weekdays there are such bus services every hour. From Gainsborough trains to the cities of Lincoln and Sheffield may be accessed. It should also be noted that if required, the towns of Doncaster, Worksop and Retford may also be accessed from Beckingham by bus. 4.2. Although access to local services is of significant importance in reducing the potential need to travel, Government guidance emphasises the importance of accessibility to public transport in determining locational sustainability. No individual village can be entirely self-sustaining, as most residents will need to travel to higher order centres to access certain essential services and for employment. Accessibility to public transport should therefore be a key factor in determining the growth potential of individual settlements. 4.6. We consider that the availability of a range of local services in Beckingham which may be accessed on foot, together with the village’s close proximity to the town of Gainsborough (less than 6km), and the availability of good public transport connections to a range of higher order centres justifies the apportionment of more than the 7 dwellings suggested in Table 10.2 of the Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation Document.
728	9	5.1. It is considered that the subject site, which currently lies outside the Beckingham settlement envelope, but immediately adjacent to established built up areas, constitutes a most suitable opportunity to round off the form of the existing settlement. It is readily accessible from the existing highway at Station Road, and would complete the street frontage between the main body of the village to the west and existing development to the east, so consolidating the form of this part of the settlement.
728	10	5.2. We have previously made representations concerning the site referred to as no. 106 for SHLAA purposes. It measures approximately 3.4ha in total. At around 30 dwellings per hectare and including approximately 10% of the site as open space, it has the potential to be developed for up to 90 dwellings. However, we recognise that such a level of development is likely to significantly exceed current local need and demand.
728	11	5.3. For the purposes of the current site-allocations exercise, we therefore propose that only the southern-most portion of the above area should be allocated for in the region of 20-25 dwellings - utilising around 1ha of the total site available and a relatively low building density - which would facilitate a development of good high quality layout and good urban design principles, to include a street frontage to Station Road with further dwellings behind. Our objective would be to agree an appropriate mix of forms and sizes of dwelling with the planning authority, so providing for a range of housing needs. Appendix 1 shows a plan view of the area concerned and demonstrates its strong relationship with existing residential plots to the east and west.
728	12	5.4. The intention would also be to include a road layout with potential to provide access to the remainder of the potentially available land to the north, so that if required to meet future development needs it could also be readily brought forward for residential development. 5.5. The proposed development also has the potential to facilitate a footpath and cycle linkage through the site, connecting Station Road with the existing track way to the north, so providing a sustainable, safe and convenient means of access for the existing residents of Station Road to the services and facilities located in the centre of the village. Beckingham Primary School and the village shop and post office are located approximately 500m from the site. 5.6. The development of the site and associated highways connections have the potential to better integrate the existing isolated ribbon development on Station Road (east of the site) with the main body of the village and the services it contains. Convenient and safe pedestrian and cycle linkages in particular, would improve quality of life for existing residents and the sustainability of this outlying part of the existing community. 5.7. The site is well contained within clearly defined physical boundaries - the northern, southern and eastern boundaries of the site being bounded by mature hedgerows, and the west abutting the existing residential area.
728	13	5.8. There are no landscape character related designations on or adjacent to the site. Therefore, the site's development would avoid any adverse impacts on the surrounding countryside. Its development is therefore preferable to some other potential sites in Beckingham which would protrude awkwardly from the existing built up area or be poorly integrated with the main body of the village. The existence of prominent hedgerows to the northern, southern and eastern boundaries in particular would reduce the landscape impact of any development, and it should be noted that the eastern boundary in particular offers a strong visual screen due to the existence of a number of trees.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
728	14	5.9. The subject site is not located within or adjacent to a Conservation Area. While it is understood that the planning authority is contemplating a possible Conservation Area designation in Beckingham, a discussion with Michael Tagg (Conservation Officer), has shown that there are currently no identified heritage assets (designated or non-designated) on or immediately adjacent to the site.
728	15	5.10. The site lies outside any designated flood zone. However, it is recognised that policy DM12 of the emerging Core Strategy would require submission of a surface water drainage assessment in due course, and we would be happy to comply with this requirement. We understand that a Sustainable Urban Drainage system will be required.
728	16	5.11. It is understood that there is an underground oil pipeline which runs within the site alongside its eastern boundary. However, it is considered that this is not a particular constraint to development as it could be incorporated within areas of garden land or public open space within the proposed development.
728	17	6.1. The planning authority's SHLAA shows a number of theoretically possible development sites located in an around Beckingham. We consider that on the basis of area alone, any of these sites could accommodate at least 10 new dwellings. However, the authority has already discounted a number of such sites as undevelopable, and we consider that none of the remaining sites offers the locational advantages and development potential of the subject site north of Station Road. 6.2. The following table provides a summary of our key observations on the alternative sites which include reference, where relevant, to significant constraints that have already been identified by the planning authority. (The site reference numbers are those used by the planning authority for SHLAA purposes. Those highlighted in red are regarded as unsuitable by the planning authority).
728	18	101, 562, 563: Sites isolated from main body of village by dual carriageway. Related access constraints and reduced potential for social cohesion. No safe or convenient pedestrian link to local services.
728	19	107: Site close to busy roads and roundabout – poor residential amenity (noise and pollution). Questions of market appeal.
728	20	102: Relatively detached from core of Beckingham village. In visible setting of Listed Buildings. Visibly prominent so greater landscape impact.
728	21	105, 203: Not logical to redevelop 105 in isolation from adjacent 203 (improved access required).Both sites include historic buildings (requiring demolition) and identified on 1774 map – heritage significance including archaeological potential.
728	22	555: Access constraints – large site but could only be served by track between existing dwellings fronting Low Street
728	23	556: Constrained access on Vicarage Lane. Relatively distant from village centre.
728	24	451: On northern edge of village. Relatively distant from village centre. Visibly prominent so greater landscape impact.
728	25	104: In visible setting of Listed buildings. Relatively distant from village centre.
728	26	497: Access constraints on Church Street (unadopted). Heritage assets nearby.
728	27	103: HER entry – earthworks – archaeological significance. Peripheral to main body of village and protrudes into open countryside – greater landscape impact.
728	28	496: Detached from existing built up area unless developed in conjunction with 103. Adjacent to A631 – road noise – greater landscape impact.
728	29	6.3. In comparison to the above sites it can be seen that the subject site is more centrally located than most. It can be readily made accessible from the existing highways network, and its development would have no significant impacts on built heritage or the wider landscape. Furthermore, it has the potential to offer a residential development with high standards of amenity and an opportunity for further expansion should the need arise. It has no significant constraints.
728	30	7.1. It is acknowledged that planning permission was granted on appeal for the development of a public house on the subject site (decision 28 March 2011). To date, the planning authority have regarded the existence of this permission as a constraint to the site's residential development, due to the community's expressed desire for a pub in the village (as referred to in the Beckingham and Saundby Parish Plan). However, enquiries with pub operators have to date proved fruitless and the owner and interested developer (Wild goose Construction) now wish to promote housing development on the site as set out in this report. 7.2. We do not consider that the existence of planning permission for a public house should prevent the alternative development of the site for residential purposes. However, given the community's expressed desire for a pub, the site owner would like to suggest that subject to relevant planning permission, an alternative and more commercially viable site could be made available for such purposes. Appendix 2 shows such a site, also in his ownership, where it is intended that we will shortly submit a planning application for the development of a public house. 7.3. We consider that the particular merits of that site for the potential development of a local public house include its situation between the main body of the village and Beckingham Sports and Social Club, but not immediately adjacent to any dwellings – thus avoiding any direct conflicts of amenity.
729	1	I am contacting you with the strongest opposition to the proposed build of 700 dwellings Gateford. I have lived on the estate 13 years, the wild life and size of the estate despite there being little enough services/conveniences(school places, lack of recreational activity centres ,the list goes on) to cover the amount of families/dwellings from the beginning ,have loved it's community positive and negative.(teenage gangs, litter being a minus, green space wildlife variety, walks a plus)
729	2	This will ruin it in my opinion the amount of traffic at the proposed entrance will cause even bigger queues at rush hour than now, it is already very congested. I apologise for such a negative view but I contest the plans in the strongest manner
729	3	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
729	4	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
729	5	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
729	6	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
729	7	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
729	8	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
729	9	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
729	10	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
729	11	At this economical time the whole country is struggling, I do not believe building more housing is the answer, improve the ones we have, re utilise the empty/derelict houses. I feel developers don't use local skills they bring most of the workforce with them ,so not generating local wealth
729	12	Behind Kilton golf course if any
729	13	behind kilton Golf course, feel this site is extensive therefore the impact of houses would be reduced, but at this time I feel Worksop doesn't have the infrastructure to cope
729	14	Don't feel mixed housing however well intended is workable
729	15	The site 35 Gateford ,would be urban sprawl, the hedge row destruction and other wild life will be desecrated, the impact to the area will be devastating as at this time there are not the amenities to over the population, This area is home to a wealth of wildlife and should remain protected as open green belt
729	16	Increase in traffic therefor pollution, increase in people ,the lack of amenities and services in place for this.
729	17	Stop the concrete jungle that's appearing in and around Gateford, loss of habitat for nature the destruction to hedgerow, wildlife and access to clean open green space ,for the public. Can you not convert to a reserve for nature
729	18	No, unfortunately the only contact I've had the travellers ruin and destroy areas, leave litter/rubbish causing environmental carnage, and a cost to the tax payer to clean up. The animals run loose and also cause havoc/safety issues. When this community pays council tax or some support to the local council then provide new sites, until then existing sites with no expansion.
729	19	I feel these travellers have their own communities and don't wish to share the same levels of habitat and community as residential sites therefore should be put together
729	20	I'm not aware of any, for potential use at this time
730	1	I don't think more housing is needed while properties are in a struggling market anyway, apart from low cost starter homes which should be built on reclaimed industrial ground to improve derelict areas - not on more green sites.
730	2	I totally object to Area 35 being developed - there are no facilities in this area other than Celtic Point
730	3	Gateford School is already stretched and has suffered in the past
730	4	there is nothing here for older children and teenagers to do
730	5	it is not on main public transport routes
730	6	would cause more problems in policing the area
730	7	traffic in peak times in and out of this estate is too busy already with only two entry/exit points to the estate
730	8	Housing right up to surrounding woodland would destroy all the natural habitats in them and currently the surrounding woods are used respectfully by many, adding up to possibly a further 3000 homes would be total overkill for the whole of the existing Gateford Estate
730	9	The open spaces in the Gateford estate are highly important to the residents, they provide areas for recreation and are used regularly by many. In conjunction with the surrounding woods and fields, the Gateford estate is hugely attractive as a better value for money alternative to Sheffield and Chesterfield workers. If it is turned into a densely packed estate of almost double the current size then it will lose much of its attraction of being close to green spaces - and the incentive to move here will be decreased, along with harder to sell properties and lower property values.
730	10	Please consider current residents and the value they place on living in a nice area with access to countryside - this will all change if you put so many more new houses on Area 35.
730	11	Sports field? Would need facilities and better access roads. Give the teenagers of Gateford something to do!

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
730	12	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
730	13	REMOVED
731	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
731	2	Option B: Focused in just one of the above towns?
732	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
732	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
733	1	No, and I believe that the proposal for 1500 new homes to be built will put significant strain on the current Worksop infrastructure - it will increase traffic and school issues. I believe the planned housing numbers needs to be significantly reduced.
733	2	I believe location 35 is unsuitable for the 700 new houses proposed
733	3	There are already significant traffic issues getting on and off the estate, with this number of houses planned this can only get worse
733	4	There would be more strain on schools and services in the area
733	5	loss of some beautiful countryside and farmland used by many walkers
733	6	Are you sure in the current climate that there is a need/market in this area for the number of houses you are proposing to build
733	7	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
733	8	I believe they should be concentrated in and around existing sites as the infra structure is already in place to support them.
733	9	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
733	10	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
733	11	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
733	12	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
733	13	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
733	14	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
733	15	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
733	16	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
734	14	The old nucleus of Walkeringham is round the church in the area on the map labelled 'Church End'. Walkeringham has no conservation area at present, but in my opinion, this area ought to be considered as a possible one, before further features and buildings are lost. It might include provided points a)-m).
735	1	The Highways Agency (HA) welcomes the opportunity to comment upon the Bassetlaw Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options document. It is the role of the HA to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN), as set out in DfT Circular 02/2007: Planning and the Strategic Road Network. Development in Bassetlaw (including housing and other uses) has the potential to impact the highway network, either on an individual or cumulative basis. In this respect, the Highways Agency's specific interest relates to the SRN in the area, comprising the A1 running through the District. The HA will therefore wish to see development proposals that are consistent with sustainable principles and are supported by appropriate and evidence-based transport policies which will help to minimise future traffic growth, mitigate any adverse impacts on the highway network, particularly the SRN, and seek to encourage sustainable travel wherever possible.
735	2	The sites included in the Issues and Options document are those which have been promoted by developers, local landowners and Parish Councils, among others, as having development potential. It is understood that a number of the proposed sites have already been screened out as a result of the assessment used for the SHLAA, and that only sites that are within or next to a settlement named in the Core Strategy Policy CS1 (Settlement Hierarchy) have been considered as having potential for development. The Agency has previously expressed broad support for the Authority's approach in the Core Strategy to accommodate growth in the main settlements within the District, such as Worksop, Retford and Harworth Bircotes. Concentrating residential development (along with retail, employment and other significant trip generating uses) in the main urban areas should provide the most sustainable locations for such growth as they are more accessible by a choice of modes of travel.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
735	3	Of the criteria proposed for use in the document, it is only the ninth, and final, criterion upon which the Agency would wish to comment. This relates to the identification of any unresolved constraints to the delivery of individual sites, and states that 'while the Council's work with infrastructure providers to date has not identified any significant strategic infrastructure problems, the development of an individual site may only be achievable if a number of locally specific infrastructure improvements are delivered before or alongside the development of the site'. The Agency welcomes the inclusion of the above statement, and the intention to identify the infrastructure necessary to support growth in Bassetlaw, as well as seeking its delivery through development. Planning conditions and s106 Agreements are likely to provide the most appropriate mechanism through which to secure such infrastructure, which may also include the provision of comprehensive package of sustainable transport measures, such as new walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure or facilities.
735	4	It is considered that further criterion could be added which identify the potential level of impact which individual sites may have upon the SRN and also the opportunities which may exist for sustainable travel. This would then support policy DM13 of the Core Strategy which seeks to ensure that opportunities are taken to reduce dependency on the private car and direct new developments towards locations with good accessibility by other means. The findings of these assessments should further assist the Authority in identifying the most suitable sites to be carried forward for consultation in the Preferred Options stage, and would strengthen the summary of key observations/concerns which is intended to be provided in relation to each site.
735	5	The Agency acknowledges the statement that the Council has, for some time, been working closely with infrastructure providers, such as Nottinghamshire County Council and the Highways Agency. This work is invaluable in helping to identify potential issues or shortfalls in infrastructure across the District, which may be exacerbated as a result of forthcoming development. The Agency is aware of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) currently being prepared by the Authority, and is keen to maintain a close level of involvement as the CIL charging schedule is developed.
735	6	The Agency welcomes the opportunity to comment upon the Issues and Options consultation of the Site Allocations DPD. This is an important stage in the identification of potential sites for development in Bassetlaw, and the Agency is keen to remain involved as the site allocation process is progressed. At this stage, it is difficult for the Agency to comment upon specific sites without a more detailed understanding of the potential impacts of development sites, both individual and cumulative, upon the SRN in the area. As discussed earlier, the HA's specific interest relates to the A1 which is coming under increasing pressure. Larger developments in particular have the potential to impact upon the highway network, including the SRN, and it is therefore important that suitable policies are in place to manage down the number of vehicle trips generated by new development and identify any mitigation and/or infrastructure requirements. The Agency is fully supportive of the intention to further assess identified sites by scoring them against a range of criteria, including whether there are any constraints to delivery. It is, however, considered that this process could be further strengthened through the inclusion of criteria relating to the potential impact on the SRN and the potential for sustainable travel. This additional detail would enable the Agency to determine whether or not specific sites or groups of sites would affect the operation of the SRN. In this regard, the Agency has a strategic traffic model, known as DIAMOND, which can provide a broad indication of the potential SRN traffic impacts of proposed development. Should the assessments undertaken by Bassetlaw District Council indicate that there are some potential impacts upon the SRN, DIAMOND may be of assistance in assessing their potential scale.
736	1	I having read proposed development plan and the SHLAA I am in broad agreement with most of the plan, conclusions and ideas about development. The charm of Retford is twofold but the two factors are linked. The relative compactness of the town centre and the ease with which open countryside can be reached in almost any direction. These are key qualities which should be very high on the list of priorities to maintain.
736	2	As I explained in my recent conversation with Jo Davies I was rather surprised and somewhat disappointed to find my house and garden included in the "Yellow zone" without any consultation. Having discussed this matter, I still wish that I had been informed in advance but accept the logic of being included.
736	3	Any redevelopment of the former factory site on Blackstope Lane will impact upon this property but frankly given the problems of an empty building as a magnet for thieves, trespassers and drug addicts almost any development is better than the current situation. Light industrial use would seem ideal if there is demand, but surely the Randall Way developments provide plenty of this at present?
736	4	I am going to be radical and suggest a community woodland. This would require demolition of the factory but would link the area with the other land (site 560) on Blackstope Lane, upon which an area of woodland is developing. This idea could even be continued across Blackstope Lane and onto the old Dairy site (44). I will even kick off the idea by offering to give the first 100 trees to the site! (I have some experience of this type of work for I have planted a large private wood in Cornwall and an arboretum at Worksop College).
737	1	First I would like to point out the council's lack of effort in trying to inform residents of what was happening, it is the residents that pay the council's wages. Of those that signed the petition, 99% had no idea what was happening until we knocked on their door. Most people are appalled with the LDF process and think that the council are underhandedly trying to sneak this in through the back door. As further evidence to substantiate this, I believe the process started in 2009 but, the document I refer to below was published by the Council on your website for comment by the public by 18 th June 2010. The fact that it did not receive a single comment should have alerted the council to the fact that no one had any knowledge of it. You organised a series of public meetings, but failed to fully inform the public about them, there was one in Retford on the 3 rd December. Additionally, from information provided by those who did attend, you originally were going to hold the meeting at the base of the town hall stairs. This clearly indicates that you did not expect many people. Secondly, when someone complained about the lack of advertisement of the meeting you got a member of the public to stick a white board outside the butter market doors, with details of the meeting. However, this was only 10 minutes before it began. Overall if you had informed the people in Retford properly dozens more residents would have been there to voice their objections.
737	2	As per our petition, our main objections are: 1) we want to keep our greenbelts and protect our wildlife: deer, fox, grass snake and barn owls have all been regularly sites in these fields. Before proposing these sites you should have done a full independent conservation study for protected wildlife and plants. Personally I have seen all the above wildlife but like you I have not checked for protected species like Great Crested Newts, Badgers etc.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
737	3	we don't want the extra traffic chaos and congestion it would create on the current quiet cul-de-sacs of Bigsby Road, Palmer Road, Longholme Road and the exists onto the main Moorgate and Welham Road. Another potential 915 houses is circa 1500 cars on roads designed as narrow quiet cul-de-sacs. What's more many existing residents have to park on the road as off road parking is restricted, which would cause problems with this increase in traffic. Access to Tiln Lane, Moorgate and Welham Road would cause chaos every morning and night, especially with Carr Hill School on Tiln Lane. Also there is little opportunity for employment in Retford so most traffic would be trying to get out to the A1, M1 or the train station. This would cause Retford ring road to grind to a standstill. Currently, but cannot cope efficiently with the existing volume of traffic and is not capable of taking the proposed additional load. As for the traffic island outside Retford Oaks School, the tailbacks every morning would stretch most of the way around Retford ring road and out to Ranby.
737	4	Retford is a small market town and we want it to stay that way. As stated in your consultation document below, you agree with this and this proposal contradicts all your existing policies and principles. It is extending Retford beyond its current development boundary lines, spreading into greenfield sites and changing Retford from the market town that it is to what will end up as another Worksop
737	5	The existing water pressure is very low, around 1.3 bar and could not cope without upgrading
737	6	Sewage is still a problem having been moved once, it would need seriously upgrading again
737	7	Parts of the site are waterlogged and subject to flooding
737	8	The sites were grade one arable land, how did the farmer even get permission in the first place to ruin this will a willow plantation
737	9	The landowners don't live in the area and have no interest in Retford. It would now cost them a fortune to turn these plots back from Willow into good farmland. They want a quick profit by selling the land with development planning they do not care about the town, the residents, or the community of Retford
737	10	First the closure of major employment sites in Retford/Ordsall like Jenkins's, Bridon Ropes and the Paper Mill all for conversion to brownfield housing as led to a shortage of employment and currently a surplus of housing. Doing the same to the Icon site would further exasperate this.
737	11	Second the lack of employment within Retford causes people to travel out of Retford (which is cheaper on housing) to places where there is employment Sheffield, Nottingham etc. This causes congestion on the Retford major roads and with most traffic wanting to get out to the A1 and M1. This along with the sighting of Retford Oaks school leads to traffic jams every morning and night that tail back around to London road, it is often 15-20 minutes to get around and out of town at rush hour morning and night.
737	12	Based on these facts I would strongly recommend the development of the mixed sites before considering purely housing developments. I would give the main priority to the North Rd site. There would be local jobs on the new site plus walking access to the industrial estates already established on the other side of the road.
737	13	Second if no local employment is available there is easy access to the A1 and M1 via Barnaby Moor or Blyth without adding further congestion to the ring road or the main Worksop Retford road.
737	14	Finally there is very little existing housing in this area that would be impacted on no extra traffic or congestion on local roads.
737	15	After North Rd I would recommend you develop the Ordsall mixed use site for similar reasons. There would be local jobs on the new site plus there are local industrial estates already established in Ordsall.
737	16	Second if no local employment is available there is easy access to the A1 and M1 via country roads without adding further congestion to the Retford ring road or the main Worksop Retford road.
737	17	Finally the existing housing in this area could be minimal impacted on as new roads could be put in minimizing the extra traffic and congestion on local roads.
738	1	i do agree with the plans to go ahead but not on site allocation 4
738	2	site allocation 35 or 30
738	3	site allocation 35 or 30
738	4	site allocation 30 or 35
738	5	yes i think site allocation 4 should be a protected site.
738	6	does the kilton golf course not have an allocated lease?
738	7	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
738	8	Do not agree with the building of a gypsy site
738	9	do not agree.
738	10	do not agree with a gypsy site
739	1	No i don't think the town of Retford should be allocated more housing, the town centre should firstly be developed to attract more people to the town and encourage employment growth.
739	2	None
739	3	51 & 259
739	4	Single use
739	5	Have you considered the potential impact these developments will have on the traffic congestion in the town
739	6	Yes I do feel that the open spaces should be protected

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
739	7	In my opinion the current town infrastructure can't take additional development without improving the road system
739	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
739	9	In existing sites
739	10	Together
739	11	No
740	1	no there is no need to develop kilton further try developing other areas such as Rhodesia/Carlton all of which need a boost.
740	2	yes in areas that need it as above
740	3	Rhodesia as school already there and bus routes and shop new housing would just lift the village
740	4	open space is essential for the young to have access too
740	5	i would like the land at kilton to be used as a wild life reserve with walks through so school children can enjoy nature i spent the best days of my childhood in the woods at the rear of kilton.
740	6	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
740	7	extend current site it makes sense
740	8	No
741	1	Acceptable
741	2	The town requires new businesses in the centre & commercial & industrial development NOT housing
741	3	I think location 35 is totally unsuitable ,the road between Carlton road & Gateford road is grid locked every morning. The loss of green belt land to make a landowner even richer is scandalous
741	4	Any commercial or industrial development should be promoted before any housing
741	5	Commercial & industrial development to sites with good links to the ring road NOT housing
741	6	Open spaces & green belt land should be protected at all cost
741	7	None
741	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
741	9	REMOVED
741	10	REMOVED
741	11	None
742	1	Location 35 is totally unsuitable unless appropriate facilities and access to and from the estate is greatly improved
742	2	The large volume of traffic already causes many delays with only 2 points of access – onto Carlton Road and onto Gateford Road. Much smaller developments in the area seem not to be as congested, especially as the 30 mph restriction on Gateford Road/Ashes Park Ave entry is completely ignored by nearly all traffic, especially large vehicles and HGV's. A serious accident is imminent.
742	3	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
743	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
743	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
744	1	Location 35 is unsuitable for the following reasons: Traffic generation, access, road safety and parking provision; the area cannot currently support the amount of traffic at present
744	2	Inadequate infrastructure to support the development; as well as roads, bus services, schools, shops, GPs etc. would not be able to support more people.
744	3	Loss of trees or hedgerows; goes without saying.
744	4	Loss of ecological habitats or landscapes; already severely affected by recent building. We need to maintain what is left
744	5	Yes
744	6	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
744	7	Existing
744	8	REMOVED
745	1	no issues
745	2	Yes any town would benefit from more housing as long as it definitely provided more employment opportunities. At the moment Worksop's infrastructure cannot support the town effectively therefor that issue needs to be addressed first rather than housing. Just as an example on numerous visits to the doctors and request for health visitors we are told that there is not enough staff to cover the area !!!
745	3	Area 35 is unsuitable for further development as per comments made in question three
745	4	There is also the issue of traffic. Trying to turn right onto gatefold road is difficult and dangerous as it is any increased traffic especially around school time is an accident waiting to happen.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
745	5	Improve existing sites before considering building new ones.
745	6	No
745	7	Yes
745	8	None
745	9	An increase in allotments provided especially with the long waiting lists. The council should be encouraging people to live a healthier life style rather than trying to squeeze as many houses into a town that cannot already support the existing houses.
745	10	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
745	11	Yes but they should also be consulted on the process
745	12	Either
745	13	None aware
746	1	Yes, housing is important, but not at the expense of green belt land. We have plenty of brown field sites that would be amply sufficient in Worksop or indeed Bassetlaw
746	2	I think that area 35 is totally unsuitable. Gateford
746	3	Harworth
746	4	I feel that this site or indeed any green belt site should not be built on at all, we have precious little land left in England and we need to keep this space open and not built upon. We moved to this estate for its open areas and views and don't need further housing here
746	5	There is, like in any town brown field sites to use.
746	6	The fact of building another 700 homes on the estate will really not add any value to the area only a detrimental one
746	7	The estate road on ashes park avenue into gatefold road is already a problem for traffic and congestion. There is the issue of further homes having an impact upon the congestion to the area
746	8	the schools can't cope now with the numbers of children, let alone with any more additional ones.
746	9	Wildlife is also rife in the area with birds, voles, birds of prey that they would have an impact on.
746	10	This needs to stay as green belt land. Tesco have been in discussions for ages about relocating, this would then relieve another possible site that could be used for housing along with other sites in the area like the old seafield or versuvius site instead of putting yet more supermarkets in the town, if we indeed do need to have more houses, these would be prime sites.
746	11	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
746	12	REMOVED
746	13	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
746	14	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
746	15	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
746	16	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
746	17	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
746	18	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
746	19	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
746	20	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
747	1	I think location 35 is UNSUITABLE
747	2	Yes
747	3	I believe the local infrastructure to location 35 in particular, cannot accommodate extra housing
747	4	I also feel that there is already a huge problem with traffic to and from the estate via Gateford Road as it is, without adding another 700 properties

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
747	5	Not to mention the lack of overall facilities for such a large housing development for e.g., lack of play areas/equipment
747	6	lack of school places in the area
747	7	already overstretched services with regards to Drs and Hospital.
747	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
747	9	REMOVED
748	1	No mention of sustainability of developments is mentioned.
748	2	There are set distances to amenities, provision of services etc. to take in to account.
748	3	No more housing other than that needed for "home grown growth". This council had repeatedly demonstrated an inability to deliver on the requirements of sustainable development. Until such time as the council put right the mistakes of the past i.e. Gateford. There should be a moratorium on further development
748	4	Location 35 is wholly unsuitable.
748	5	YES
748	6	Re site 35. The existing school infrastructure in Gateford is already above capacity. So any development of this scale would need schools, child-care, Doctors Surgery, community facilities, provided for all age groups
748	7	How would the secondary schools cope in 10-15 years time with an extra 1000-1500 children.
748	8	The roads on the gatefold estates are already under provided with safe crossings, the junction with the Gateford road and Ashes Park road is already over capacity in rush hour.
748	9	Then there is the loss of community space
748	10	Park land, shop, Doctors, community facilities, child care.
748	11	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
748	12	REMOVED
749	1	Option A
749	2	Absolutely not, There are already enough new houses built/ in the process and the infrastructure of the villages is yet to be treated by their presence.
749	3	None
749	4	Yes
749	5	Existing sites should be utilised to aid continuity and already established amenities
749	6	Together to create 'community' and contact arrangement
749	7	Gringley is currently undergoing a major change as a result of the provision of more than 60 new homes on the former detention centre (DC) site. This is a development of significant size compared to the size of the village. No Rural service Centre villages have proposed new developments of this size. The former DC site development will provide a major share of the Rural Service Centre housing requirements in the BDC Site Allocations and Options plan and further developments in Gringley are not required. The effects of the former DC site on Gringley are yet to be understood. It will be a densely-populated site which will strain the village infrastructure and services, cause a major increase in village traffic and a build-up of traffic entering and leaving the A631 by-pass. Further development of the proposed site in the centre of the village will make this situation worse.
749	8	The character and structure of Gringley benefit from open spaces between and around the houses and farms. A finger of countryside extends into the centre of the village and is highly regarded as a landscape feature by occupiers of surrounding properties and other villagers. The proposed site occupies a significant part of the western end of this feature. Development of the site would be undesirable and would set a precedent for further incursions into this open land.
749	9	The proposed development site adjoins and would lead from Low Street, which is a narrow lane, with no footpaths. Access from the west is via a blind bend with an existing junction at the bottom of Cross Hill with Laycock Avenue. Village traffic and agricultural vehicles use this route for access to Middlebridge Road and the east side of the village, including the Playing Field. This traffic will increase as a result of the former DC site development. Further traffic arising from access to the proposed new site by residents and service providers would be undesirable.
749	10	Low Street is a narrow lane with grass verges and banks topped by low walls or hedges. The Gringley-on-the-Hill Parish Plan in 2004 states that these features form an integral part of the village character. This character would be adversely affected by the proposals. The village character of Gringley benefits from an existing street system dating from mediaeval times, with a unique situation of pastures, smallholdings and orchards with continuous connection to the countryside. Current and former uses of the proposed site include paddock, pasture and vegetable cultivation. A housing development on the site would terminate these traditional uses and would be deleterious to the village character and its associated ecology.
749	11	This would not be in-keeping with this part of the village and is not required. Site maintenance to a good standard would be a cost to the village and may not always be achieved
749	12	The proposed site is well-overlooked and the development plan suggested would adversely affect the amenity of adjacent properties through noise, disturbance and lack of privacy.
749	13	The proposed development site includes an area which is not to be developed. This offers little to overcome the effects of the proposals on the village character and the amenity of surrounding properties
750	1	Yes
750	2	only if it is strictly controlled with no damage to the environment

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
750	3	The location 35 is NOT suitable
750	4	all
750	5	Yes at all costs
750	6	no
750	7	Existing waste land and derelict buildings should be used firstly for housing development. It is paramount there must be more preservation and conservation of land within Bassetlaw
750	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
750	9	Existing sites, less impact on the environment
750	10	Together, easy to manage
750	11	None
750	12	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35. This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.
750	13	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
750	14	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
750	15	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
750	16	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
750	17	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
750	18	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
750	19	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
750	20	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
751	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
751	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
751	3	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
751	4	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
751	5	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
751	6	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
751	7	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
751	8	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
751	9	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
751	10	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
751	11	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35. This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.
752	1	The only benefits i can see to the town would possibly be to have some allocated employment growth but this has to be very well researched as we have far too many run down/closing businesses that are not in the right location/do not have sufficient rental support/business rate support from the council.
752	2	In terms of housing i feel very strongly that the provision of council houses in this town is an absolute shambles. I see people who have relatively well paid secure jobs being allowed to stay in council properties where they have lower rent and maintenance included - this is preposterous and surely tenant agreements should be reviewed annually - if people are earning over a particular threshold make them rent privately to increase their rent to that the same as a mortgage! I also know of single people living in 3 bedroomed council houses - where is the sense in that?? You could put a family i those houses!!
752	3	Location 35 is UNSUITABLE - this would seriously detract from (in my opinion) the most pleasant housing area in Worksop
752	4	It would certainly decrease house prices
752	5	have environmental effects to its detriment
752	6	Location 35 is UNSUITABLE (as above)
752	7	Location 35 SHOULD BE PROTECTED! This is a very beautiful part of Worksop and brings much joy to homeowners in this area. For both scenery, and recreational activities.
752	8	Option B: Focused in just one of the above towns?
752	9	REMOVED
753	1	Yes
753	2	No to more housing and employment in the kilton area
753	3	Manton Wood
753	4	Manton Wood
753	5	I do not support the mixed use site on the kilton golf course area
753	6	Yes as Worksop has only a few medium/large areas that are open spaces, so these should be kept
753	7	No
753	8	Existing land in the kilton area should be kept as it is now
753	9	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
753	10	Traveller sites should not be allocated land in any of the locations in the aforementioned document
753	11	Together, for ease of use
753	12	Same answer as for question 121
754	1	No opinion
754	2	No
754	3	I think location 35 to the north of Gateford is unsuitable for 700 houses as the road junctions are already stretched and can be unsafe
754	4	It is also a very large area of farmland to lose, which would ruin the outlook from the existing houses
754	5	I also don't believe there is adequate school places in the local area for this many extra residents
754	6	I absolutely believe that the areas identified to be protected should be. Worksop needs to keep these areas for use by residents and to keep its identity. Building on more of these green spaces would ruin the area. Please protect these areas as once they are built on they are lost forever.
754	7	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
754	8	They should be kept around existing sites.
754	9	Together.
755	1	I believe there already copious amounts of dis-used space derelict building that would provide the perfect option to convert into new build houses/flats closer to the town centre. Rather than destroy the little countryside that remains
755	2	I believe that site 35 would be unsuitable for housing due to accessibility off the estate which is already strained
755	3	Also the continued pressure on the local amenities education and health services.
755	4	I believe that location 35 should be protected, there is already a large number of property on this small area. i believe that residents deserve the opportunity to use the little land that remains. Also to allow nature to have a little piece of home
755	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
756	1	Yes that's fine

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
756	2	Not at all, enough housing.
756	3	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
756	4	none
756	5	no thanks
756	6	yes
756	7	REMOVED
756	8	Leave as is.
756	9	Option B: Focused in just one of the above towns?
756	10	REMOVED
756	11	REMOVED
756	12	REMOVED
757	1	I would strenuously object to the development of location 35. Why? 1) Schooling for a start. We live less then 2/3 mile from Gateford School but ended up 18th on the list when we wanted to get our daughter in. There are 4 children in the immediate vicinity of the same age and all 4 go to different schools due to this issue. The school she currently attends has 31 children in the class. I'm sure that adding more residences is not going to alleviate this issue.
757	2	2) The traffic exiting Ashes Park Avenue to Gateford Road at 8:30 is very heavy, exacerbated by issue 1) no doubt, with queues back to the Scampton\Alexander island not uncommon. Again, more residences will not help, not only the traffic and the danger this poses to pedestrians but the additional pollution created by the extra vehicles.
757	3	3) Local amenities are already scarce, with most situated in town and the re-location of Tesco will make travel into town, which is only practical by car, even more necessary. Increase traffic, pollution and danger.
757	4	4) Less agricultural land. This country is already woefully inadequate at supplying it's own needs, removing more agricultural land not only loses jobs, but the skills necessary to work the land.
757	5	5) Where do the kids go to learn about nature? We can easily walk to Owday on a sunny weekend, without having to resort to using the car, surely that's an admiral sentiment, to show the younger generation that we're not reliant on cars to do everything. Remove the land, and what's the next option? Clumber Park? Resort to the car again, with all it's necessary issues.
757	6	6) How will building more houses bring in more business and money to Worksop? Enticing more business into the town centre, etc., might. Some extra housing may in the short term, but surely we need sustainable growth in the community not additional drain on already stretched resources.
757	7	Option A
758	1	Please have links attached that allow you to navigate without losing everything you have commented on
758	2	Hasn't taken in to consideration the poor bus service to Sheffield and Meadowhall Poor internet speed which will be slower with additional housing No facilities for young people inadequate new cinema development
758	3	Lack of good quality shops other than M&S in town centre
758	4	Poor issues and fluctuating electricity at times to Gateford estates Has sewage and water supplies also been considered
758	5	Poor issues and fluctuating electricity at times to Gateford estates
758	6	Has sewage and water supplies also been considered
758	7	Poor quality single carriageway links to A1 /M1 Sheffield A57,Blyth routes where many residents work and adding additional cars to already busy roads
758	8	A town needs to grow and develop but it is being sensitive about this There are areas of brown site land e.g. glass works which could be developed to great sites which Bassetlaw have turned down, or the cinema which will be paltry and could have been larger or have a bowling alley as well
758	9	Unable to access as lost web page and questionnaire last time. Not Gateford North area of natural beauty
758	10	Unable to access but area near A57 roundabout or Kilton
758	11	Near A57 roundabout near scrap yard ideal for new retail park. Glass works mixed use site other housing
758	12	Areas with woodland hedgerows streams and wildlife should be protected Gateford green areas should be protected. There has been lots of development in this area and the wildlife is now returning badgers, foxes, partridges, birds, birds of prey, bats, water voles etc.
758	13	High traffic at busy times exiting Gateford North queue now 30 mins
758	14	Lack of reliable transport on this site
758	15	Lack of facilities and already very busy small shopping precinct Lack of Gap and potentially not enough emergency service provision for the area
758	16	Lack of power water drainage to an area already highly developed
758	17	Poor facilities for teenagers
758	18	Lack of Nursery primary and secondary school provision

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
758	19	Not enough retail outlet development such as next If Bassetlaw plan they need to be much more forward thinking and not wait 10-12 years before they build things more joined up working get the infrastructure correct
758	20	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
758	21	REMOVED
758	22	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
758	23	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
758	24	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
758	25	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
758	26	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
758	27	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
758	28	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
758	29	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
759	1	I oppose the development of location 35 at Gateford, Worksop. The access to Ashes Park Avenue from Gateford Road is totally unsatisfactory already. There have been a number of accidents along Gateford Road in recent years and access and exit from the estate at busy times is a nightmare. Any further development on the Gateford estate would only makes this junction even more dangerous so I absolutely disagree with any further housing growth
759	2	My second concern is around access to GP's and dentists. Doctors appointments at Larwood surgery are an on going problem and I now have to travel to Langold for access to an NHS dentist. Increasing the Gateford population by a significant numbers only stretches these resources even further
759	3	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
760	1	I believe the developments on sites 35, 26, W6 should not go ahead because of the following: the sites are in areas with woodland and hedgerows would be lost which will have a detrimental effect on wildlife.
760	2	In addition the public footpaths are well used by the public for walks and taking dog walking.
760	3	I believe the developments on sites 35,26 and 28 & W6 should not go ahead because of the following: the sites are on areas with woodland and hedgerows would be lost which will have an detrimental effect on wildlife. In addition the public footpaths are well used by the public for walks and taking dog walking
760	4	The developments on sites W35 26 and 28 & W6 will cause considerable increases on Gateford road, which will increase the already existing problems of traffic backing up on existing estates as well as the proposed ones
760	5	The proposed additional developments in Shireoaks will increase further traffic on the A57 and Gateford road roundabout, which will cause more traffic to back on Gateford road.
760	6	Noise from the existing industrial estate on Claylands is already is an issue at times, what business will be allowed on site W6. plus lorries going into the state will have an impact on traffic see above
760	7	Flooding has been a problem the existing Gateford estate, with sites 26 and 28 & W6 will appropriate levels of drainage to be put in place to ensure that these sites and the existing Gateford estate (and Gateford road) be protected against flooding, because with the loss of farm land, any run off water will have to go somewhere
760	8	I believe the developments on sites 35,26 and 28 & W6 are in the wrong place. These developments should take place on areas to the north west of sites identified as 195, 343 and W8 therefore avoiding further traffic being added to Gateford road and Gateford road roundabout/A57, because of private and businesses vehicles which need to travel to Sheffield and beyond
760	9	In addition many existing industrial estates in Worksop and Shireoaks have vacant premises already, surely having more industrial units is not going to help this situation.
761	1	Location 35 Gateford North is unsuitable. The existing infrastructure does not exist and will not cope with added burden of additional home construction
761	2	The existing junction from Ashes Park Avenue onto Gateford Road is already over capacity and therefore dangerous due to the volume of traffic, the layout of the junction and the approach speed of traffic on Gateford Road. Traffic often queues along Ashes Park well past the first mini roundabout

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
761	3	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
762	1	I agree with the criteria but it does not appear to have been applied very rigorously in terms of section 2.6 when choosing some of the sites.
762	2	Development for employment on brownfield site would be acceptable
762	3	I strongly object to the proposal for site reference 35 as the majority of the factors listed in section 2.6 would be adversely affected. Development of this area would certainly detract from the Green Infrastructure
762	4	Open spaces should be protected from any unnecessary development.
762	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
762	6	In and around existing sites
762	7	Together
763	1	Basically sound
763	2	In view of the time taken to fill the Celtic Point development I would not have thought that the town can take another large development particularly in the north of the town.
763	3	3 and site 4
763	4	4
763	5	All of the open spaces should be protected (and if possible expanded) - they are very important for the well-being of communities.
763	6	I am totally opposed to site 35 being developed. This is prime agricultural land that has been used to grow wheat, potatoes, carrots and oilseed rape (among others). Its loss, including those of the valuable hedgerows and close proximity of the buildings to the existing woodland would have a seriously negative impact on the natural environment
763	7	This development would double the number of houses in the Gateford development and overload the already busy road network - trying getting off Ashes Park Avenue in the morning! A roundabout or set of lights would in no way solve this problem. The amenities in the area are at best minimal and would be totally inadequate to cater for additional housing
763	8	This development is both outside the borders of Gateford and also at the limits of the broadband connection - the distance from the exchange resulting in relatively poor connection speeds. This is an additional issue that needs consideration wherever housing is built.
763	9	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
764	1	I don't feel competent to comment on this.
764	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
764	3	10 houses seems reasonable.
764	4	My preference would be to see the plot Ref no. 256 used for housing.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
764	5	<p>I would like to make representations for the land Ref No.251 NOT to be earmarked for development or housing. The reason is that the entire piece of this 8 acres of land is currently being used for the environmental social enterprise Rhubarb Farm, which is a Community Interest Company. This 8 acres comprises a 2 acre site adjoining the Recreation Ground owned by the Langwith Society, and a 6 acre piece owned by a local farmer. Rhubarb Farm has 25 year leases on both pieces of land, in order to run the social enterprise with some security and to enable funding to be drawn down. Rhubarb Farm provides work placements, training and volunteering opportunities for people who are unemployed, ex-offenders, ex-service personnel, NEETs, have mental or physical ill health, or learning disabilities. We do this through growing of fruit and vegetables. Our aims are to raise aspirations for employment and training, improve health and promote low impact living through environmental modelling. In September 2010 Rhubarb Farm received planning permission from Bassetlaw District Council for the erection of fencing, composting toilets, storage sheds, polytunnels, signage and containers as storage and offices. (Application Reference No. 64/10/2).Rhubarb Farm started operating on site in January 2011, and since then have:- 1. Had 100 volunteers come to work on Rhubarb Farm, many of them the easiest to forget, and hardest to engage by any organisation. 2. Created 6 jobs, 4 of which have been taken by people local to the site. 3. Won an award from Bassetlaw Health and Physical Exercise Partnership for our work in improving health through exercise. 4. Taken 3 ex-offenders on placement to pay off their Community Service Order hours. 5. Taken a regular weekly Community Service Order hours team to work on the site 6. Held 3 large community events to engage the local communities in our work. 7. Begun to establish a Community Supported Agriculture Scheme, which is integrate community and agriculture by managing a mixed sustainable and environmentally responsible farm for the benefit of everyone involved. It will supply weekly veg boxes to members. 8. Won a contract from the Home Office to provide employment for two ex-offenders on the CSA. 9. Won an award from the British Heart Foundation to run courses and an event. The courses are (i) a cookery course for young parents to help them move away from prepared and chip shop food, and (ii) a cookery course for people with mental ill health to help them cook more nutritious food, esp when their mental health is bad. 10. Run a Vegetable Growing course to teach local people how to grow their own. More of these will be run in 2012. 11. Run a Confidence Building Course (funded by Firm Foundations), a pizza oven making course and 2 woodworking courses. We shall be running more of these in 2012. 12. Won funding from Nottinghamshire County Council Social Enterprise Office, Bassetlaw PCT, Nottinghamshire Freemasons, and Nottinghamshire Let's Build. All these funders have recognised the work we are trying to do to improve the lives of people in the area. 13. Rhubarb Farm is about to take on 10-12 NEETs between the ages of 16 and 18 as apprentices under the National Apprenticeship programme to work on the CSA, and help them to get NVQ2 in either Customer Relations, Business Admin or Horticulture. 14. Rhubarb Farm has been in partnership with Nottingham University Environmental Technology Centre (ETC) since 2010, and they have funded us for the materials to erect composting toilets. They also advised us about insulation of our office container, to make it energy-efficient, and put us in touch with a company which provided us with about £7,000 worth of pro bono insulation for the container, so that it is energy-efficient. 15. Also in partnership with the ETC, we are hoping to win a contract from the Department of Energy to do research on solar PV, water harvesting and energy-saving measures to promote in the local community. We are particularly keen to encourage environmentally sustainable practices and want to be seen as a flagship organisation in the district. 16. We are establishing a wildlife area on part of the site, and have just won three separate amounts of funding for a large pond liner, shelter, wildlife planting and pathing to enable us to run an environmental afterschool club to engage local children and promote knowledge of wildlife issues generally. We currently provide formal weekly placements for 6 groups and individuals (i) a learning disability group from a residential home (ii) a young person in foster care (iii) a group from a mental health hospital (iv) NEETs on enrichment programme (v) students at risk of dropping out from a local school and (vi) a man from a mental health hospital. 18. We have a contract to provide a programme for NEETs and to this end have employed a youth worker to engage them. 6 young people come for 6 weeks twice weekly to work on site. We shall now be employing one of the most recent batch as an apprentice on our new apprenticeship programme, starting March 2012, demonstrating our value as helping people with very low self-confidence and poor educational levels into employment. (this is separate and additional to our provision of placements for NEET enrichment activities.) 19. In January 2011 we employed three young local men under the Future Jobs Fund. We raised enough money to keep them on 3 months beyond the end of their 6 month employment period, and then 2 of them found other jobs, and we have continued to employ the third as a gardener. 20. In 2011, although only starting to turn the land (which had been a wilderness for over 20 years) in January Rhubarb Farm volunteers planted onions, potatoes, broad beans, runner beans, peas, courgettes, beetroot, parsnips, squash</p>
764	6	<p>22. Rhubarb Farm has a Board of Directors, comprising 4 people: the Secretary of the Langwith Society, an ex-CEO of a social enterprise and ex-DWP official, and the social enterprise officer of a national charity. As a Community Interest Company all assets are locked, directors cannot take dividends, and all profit has to be used for the benefit of the community. We are accountable to The CIC Regulator, Companies House but can raise funds from charitable trusts. 23. Rhubarb Farm has an Advisory Board consisting of 4 councillors, a mental health worker, a business adviser, the manager of a mental health hospital, a YMCA Manager, a Health Improvement worker, 2 local Langwith residents, and 3 Rhubarb Farm volunteers. 24. Two groups of magistrates have recently visited Rhubarb Farm and been extremely impressed as to how people of different needs and issues have all been working together on site – they described it as fantastic integration, and most unexpected.</p>
764	7	<p>25. Rhubarb Farm has recently come first in a national award from the Newspaper Society, to get free newspaper advertising of our services and business mentoring from Deborah Meaden. These adverts, which we will use to promote the CSA, will be placed in The Mansfield Chad newspaper. 26. In February, in partnership with Two Shires Credit Union (based in Worksop) Rhubarb Farm is starting a weekly Credit Union collection point at Rhubarb Farm. It will be staffed by local volunteers, who are being trained by Two Shires Credit Union, and is a step towards reducing local dependency on loan sharks, who are a plague in the village. Rhubarb Farm hopes that Bassetlaw District Council will take all these aspects about Rhubarb Farm into consideration when coming to a decision about the future of Site Ref. no 251.</p>

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
764	8	Rhubarb Farm wishes to stress the need to keep Site 251 in use as agricultural land farmed by Rhubarb Farm, because of its social, environmental and employment value to the local community and wider stakeholders like local authority and various services. The local ex-offenders that we will employ will be working on this piece of land, as will the apprentices, and they will be growing organic vegetables for the Community Supported Agriculture Scheme. This piece of land will therefore be of great value socially, agriculturally and environmentally. We will be bringing it back into agriculture use after it has lain fallow for a long time, creating employment, creating interest in fresh organic produce, creating a diversity of crops and wildlife and bringing health to all those who come to work/volunteer on the land. We anticipate at least 200 volunteers will come to Rhubarb Farm to work in 2012. We shall be running Farm Days, involving CSA members on the land and generally making a rich and diverse environment. We have the support of the people of Nether Langwith, Langwith and Whaley Thorns, and those living beside Site 251 have endorsed and encouraged our work in various ways. One neighbour sits on the Rhubarb Farm Advisory Group, many come to our events, some have given all the apples from their trees two years running for our apple-juicing and soup events, others come to our meetings, or take an interest through our newsletters and website. www.rhubarbfarm.co.uk It would be a tragedy for Rhubarb Farm to lose the use of the land Ref. No 251, as we are just at the start of our enterprise, and have many plans to expand and develop our work to benefit more people, the environment and the economic climate of the area. We have reached the second stage of a bid to the Big Lottery (only 20% of applicants nationally reach this stage) and this will be to run a Buddying Project to support more people with mental ill health.
765	1	Yes
765	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
765	3	Yes for at least 5 new homes
765	4	410 would be my preferred site, but 412 is an alternative.
765	5	I agree that the open spaces should be protected
765	6	Yes, this site is currently laying vacant and already causing concern among residents. I agree that some housing maybe a benefit to redeveloping the site.
765	7	Existing sites
765	8	Together
766	1	take out green field sites from your list - plenty of potential with brown sites
766	2	No new houses, there are plenty of unused houses and new builds not being sold due to the fact that there are no buyers for them.
766	3	none
766	4	none
766	5	no - leave housing and industry separate
766	6	Grove Hills sends millions of gallons of rainwater down towards sites 3,311,570 - significant millions of pounds of investment would be needed to the drainage systems to cope with extra housing on these sites
766	7	The fields and ditches have been home to some wildlife which need protecting - such sightings as small snakes and the humble field mouse have been noted by locals.
766	8	Grove Coach Road at this point is allocated a restricted byway.
766	9	Sites 3,311,570 are flood plains and are not suitable for development. This has been confirmed by NRA National Rivers Authority and Anglian Water. The areas houses already flood in bad rain and to put more houses there means more houses will flood. Previous attempts to put houses on these fields have failed due to these issues. Are the council going to invest millions to sort out new drainage? If so where do they get this money from as there are many other bigger issues to spend this money on.
766	10	Option B: Focused in just one of the above towns?
766	11	absolutely no way
766	12	together
766	13	none
767	1	yes
767	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
767	3	yes
767	4	yes it would, as i don't agree with any development on this site.
767	5	we need more senior citizens bungalow's in (No Suggestions), at least 30, as people are living longer.
767	6	off yew tree road, explained at meeting, as been postponed now, due to traffic problems, drainage, etc.
767	7	yes, in existing ones
767	8	near pepperly rise, back of headland, but the incinerator at crookford could jeopardise that if they get the go ahead.
768	1	Option A
769	1	Yes
769	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
769	3	I am happy for a maximum of 8 houses to be built in Gringley over the next 15 years

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
769	4	However, I would not want to see too many grouped together on one site, as this does not sit well with the existing form of the village. A housing estate type development is inappropriate, although I accept that this is what is happening on the former detention centre site. However, this is on one side of the village so has less impact. Since only 8 houses are planned over 15 years, these should be split over a number of possible sites, rather than all put on one or perhaps 2 sites.
769	5	Site 135: This is a sloping site and a good open space at present. Given very sympathetic design of the buildings, I would be happy to see up to 3 homes on this site.
769	6	Access from Low Street is difficult - the road is very narrow, with no hope of widening, and no footpath.
769	7	The site is also higher than the North side of Low Street, where a number of bungalows are located, and there would need to be a height restriction on building to avoid them being too overpowering to adjacent properties. Good design will be the key to ensuring any development blends in with the surroundings.
769	8	Site 134: This site needs sympathetic renovation, and could probably be modified to create 2 homes. I would not wish the existing buildings to be demolished - rather used as the basis for new homes.
769	9	Sites: 23/2, 23/3 and 23/4. No development should ever be permitted on these valuable open spaces.
769	10	The key to all development in the village is to ensure that good architects are used who can work with the local style of buildings. When done well, new houses can blend in very well with the village - Gringley Court, for example. However, when done badly, (and I won't name names) - the effect is disastrous!
769	11	Sites: 23/2, 23/3 and 23/4. No development should ever be permitted on these valuable open spaces.
769	12	Around existing sites - because that will probably cause less difficulty than trying to establish a "green field" site.
769	13	Together, I would have thought
769	14	No
770	1	Do not agree with the screening methodology
770	2	Option A: Spread between Workso; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
770	3	An agreement to a maximum of 4 houses however I see no reason for building any new houses due to the amount of land development in Retford and surrounding areas already taking place.
770	4	281 or 282
770	5	The residents I have spoken to are fully opposed to any further development around this peaceful village
770	6	Yes the sites identified should be protected from development for the purpose of building development
770	7	There is already a site designated at Daneshill. There is no need for a further site being developed
770	8	No
771	1	I am happy with the list of constraints contained in Para 2.6. If they are listed in priority order I don't agree with that but I am happy that all these factors should be considered. As a household which has twice been affected by flooding I believe that flood risk should be a key consideration given the misery that flooding causes.
771	2	Retford does need employment growth. In the 25 years that I have lived here the manufacturing and mining base has shrunk and we have had insufficient increase in new industry. I note significant logistics growth in Workso and Newark but nothing of note in Retford. Our proximity to the newly upgraded A1 should make us an ideal base for future expansion.
771	3	As for more housing, at the moment the current developments cannot sell their existing provision so in the short term there seems little point in allocating new housing land.
771	4	However I do acknowledge that this is as long term planning document therefore if we can attract more employment into the area then we may well need more housing.
771	5	As mentioned previously my house has been affected by flooding on 2 separate occasions. I am well aware that mine is not the only Ouse so affected and that some were more seriously affected than me. However, having your ground floor flooded to a depth of 4 inches leaves a significant financial and emotional burden. The entire eastern flank of Retford, in the lee of Grove Hill, lives under a permanent risk of flooding and some of my neighbours do still get frightened when there is heavy rain. The belt of agricultural land between Grove Hill and the current housing provides the 'sponge' and soak away to protect housing. To build on that land would result in more water being used (by households) and less green land to act as the sponge.
771	6	There are parts of Retford, to the north and west which are not subject to flood risk and these would seem far more sensible places to build.
771	7	I am too aware that Retford has a difficult transport infrastructure with 2 railway lines, a river and a canal all contributing to road traffic management considerations. Without considerable road infrastructure changes some of the sites would result in considerable congestion increases at already over crowded crossroads and junctions.
771	8	So, my opinion is that sites 1, 37, 40, 41, 51 and R7 52, 364 and 512 are the best sites both in terms of minima flood risk and least disruption to transport infrastructure.
771	9	Sites 3, 370, 511, 488 and 489 are totally unsuitable for housing because they constitute a significant and on going flood risk, there is no easy expansion of the transport infrastructure, the local primary school could not cope with the increased capacity, it is usable and used agricultural land.
771	10	Overall I would like to see employment opportunities restricted to current areas rather than developing new areas. The town centre should be reserved for retail and commercial development and there are a few 'eyesores' which need attention e.g. that big derelict building on Grove Street. The Randall Way area has scope for some further expansion.
771	11	The proposals outlined in paras 5.10 and 5.11 do have some industrial potential as well as housing potential but as mixed sites it might require some restrictions on the type of employment activity to be allowed.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
771	12	Retford is blessed with a number of open spaces, not all well utilised at the moment. I would like to see these further developed as open spaces at some point in the future so please do not remove them now simply because they are not being used. Also the feeling of town in the country needs to be preserved. The open spaces we have help to bring the countryside right into the heart of the town.
771	13	Not a simple answer, some do need redeveloping, Oakland's for instance, site 1/21 and 1/23 is a valuable sporting site. somewhat run down at the moment but it does have potential to be of real benefit to Retford people.
771	14	Kings Park and the Cemetery need to be maintained.
771	15	Other open spaces should be left largely to nature.
771	16	Some, parts of 1/22 don't seem to serve much purpose at all and could be developed for housing. (I know that there is a football pitch at the bottom and that should be preserved).
771	17	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
771	18	I have no expertise on this but I would have thought that it makes sense to maintain and develop existing sites since I assume that they were located where they are as a result of a proper consultation and planning process.
771	19	Don't know. I suggest that you consult the traveller community but see my answer to question 121
772	1	Yes, but must ensure the character of the town is maintained and that brown field sites are used before any expansion into green field sites. Any expansion into green field areas should take account of the kind of development that these are adjacent to first.
772	2	for plot 7, I want to make the following points. 1. The road systems that feed Bigsby Road that currently grants access to plot 7 is fed by narrow roads that are parked on by householders who do not have any alternative. As such, it is very difficult to pass and creates a danger to both the drivers and footpath users at this moment in time. the inclusion of 700+ houses on plot 7 would be much worse.
772	3	2. There will be a loss of open space and public footpaths that are used by high numbers of the public.
772	4	3. Loss of wildlife habitat
772	5	1. I would not want to see plot 7 developed for the reasons stated in Q13
772	6	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
772	7	Around existing sites only
772	8	Together for better provision of facilities and for a clear understanding of where this is.
773	1	Yes
773	2	Employment growth is essential in order to ensure that there are enough people who can afford to buy new houses. I am not aware of any real efforts to encourage significant employers to set up in the Retford area. The figures provided demonstrate how little employment development has taken place in 2012/11.
773	3	Current housing development sites seem to be on hold or there are houses that cannot be sold so it is hard to predict how much new housing should be allocated.
773	4	The sites to the east of the town are subject to flooding. Where I live there have been two very bad incidents of flooding in the early 1990s and more recently about 5 years ago. Water drains down from the hill behind my house and onto the fields that are now identified as possible housing sites (511/370/3). These fields act as a flood plain and if built upon the rain would not be able to drain away so easily unless expensive drainage work is undertaken.
773	5	Also there is very limited access by road and the local primary school is full.
773	6	The road on which Bracken Lane School is sited is very narrow and there is already a lot of congestion and the associated problems with parking and road safety.
773	7	I feel that the sites to the north and west are more suitable, particularly out along North Road i.e. 512, 37, 7, 46 and 309 to the north and 364, 41, 40, 52 and 1 to the west.
773	8	the site to the north seems most appropriate due to transport links (51 and R7)
773	9	I would like to comment on the way in which this consultation has been done. It has not been adequately publicised. We have not been individually notified of the proposals. Also this survey is very hard to access, possibly to make it less likely that there will be much response and more likely that these proposals can go ahead unchallenged.
773	10	yes
773	11	yes, I would like more facilities for recreation and sport, young people need constructive forms of entertainment such as improved athletics facilities at Oakland's playing field.
773	12	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
773	13	Yes- It makes sense to develop existing sites on the assumption that their current locations were properly researched and consultation was made with the travelling community.
773	14	together to make the best use of facilities
774	1	In principle, yes.
774	2	It is very important that the character of the village is taken into account.
774	3	New houses, unless they are specifically allocated for the elderly, should have a reasonable sized garden for a rural property and must have off-street parking for at least two cars per dwelling.
774	4	Building houses without sizable gardens will turn this rural village into a town.
774	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
774	6	The existing planned developments will stretch the services significantly - school places, sewage and traffic in particular. There is logic in providing some additional sheltered housing in the centre of the village, on the bus route - the High Street frontage of the plot marked 142 would be very appropriate for this.
774	7	Other than this, in the next 16 years there will be opportunities to develop backland and infill between existing properties to provide all 11 houses.
774	8	All planning consents should be required to comply with the Village Design Statement prepared about 15 years ago and apparently overlooked by planning permissions since.
774	9	Site 142, High Street frontage only, for sheltered and possibly 'first time' buyer housing.
774	10	Site 143 is a corner of land too small for serious agricultural use; although close to the A57 it would be reasonable to allow one or perhaps two houses on the site with access onto the High Street.
774	11	Site 145 Should be set up in such a way as to provide alternative access to the planned development on the Chicken Factory (site 196).
774	12	Sites 108 and 146 might be appropriate for development if necessary but in both cases it should be single road frontage development.
774	13	Site 110. Development here on the footprint of the existing former farm and industrial buildings would be appropriate. The extension along Tuxford Road would not.
774	14	Sites 111, 112 and 150 should be ruled out completely - they are very close to the main road and the east Coast Main line railway and are on the edge of the village, with poor access. Development of either would require opening the two tracks onto the A57 which be hazardous for the traffic on that road.
774	15	School.
774	16	Sewage.
774	17	Traffic.
774	18	Parking.
774	19	Broadband.
774	20	Lack of shop/post office.
774	21	All the open spaces defined on the map should be protected. It is vital that ample open space within the village is preserved so that it does not take on the character of an inconvenient town.
774	22	No. The Markham Moor site is clearly significantly under-utilised; there is no point therefore in contemplating additional sites in the area.
774	23	Together - because I cannot see any reason for separating them.
774	24	No
775	1	I think location 35 is not suitable for the planned development of 700 houses. I believe this development will have negative impact on the area for several reasons:
775	2	1, Using a greenfield location is ludicrous when there are so many brownfield sites available.
775	3	2, The woods surrounding the proposed development are a precious and well used amenity for the existing population, building on them and restricting access to them would be unforgivable.
775	4	3, At peak times traffic levels on roads around Ashes Park Avenue are very high, gridlock would occur if the development did not have additional access to Gateford Road.
775	5	4, Local amenities are still woeful, this development would put even more strain on them.
775	6	5, Houses have had flooding issues in this area, replacing farmland with concrete in this vast area will undoubtedly make the situation worse.
775	7	All in all there are other sites available which would have less of a negative impact on existing residents.
775	8	Nabs Ashes wood together with adjoining wooded areas are an extremely important and well used refuge for both wildlife and people who want to escape from the urbanised area of the Ashes Park Avenue corridor. Areas such as these should be fiercely defended, the development of location 35 would both destroy part of the woods and greatly restrict access to the other wooded areas. This should not be allowed to happen.
775	9	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
776	1	yes to a certain degree although the loss of view would be very disappointing
776	2	I do believe that some additional housing would benefit the town but I would like to see projections of how this additional building of homes will proportionately increase employment in the town.
776	3	I would question how can building additional homes, decrease the towns unemployment? Most building workers are skilled and semi killed tradesmen. Training is currently very sparse for the unemployed due to government cuts. What measures will be put in place to ensure that extra housing will mean more jobs? There has been little development for the past 11 years due to internal wrangling within the council. Council housing has also been poorly managed, with loss of government funding due to Bassetlaw council being unable to maintain key performance indicators over the last few years. Why should further building works be managed more efficiently by the local council judging by the councils past record? I would like to remind council that the building of a cinema has been on and off for a long period which is one indication that as a council you cannot agree.
776	4	The site reference number 35 is unsuitable in my opinion. My reasons are:
776	5	1.disruption to the neighbourhood with additional site traffic and noise levels increase.
776	6	2.Loss of access to walkers, and conservationists to nearby fields and woods.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
776	7	3.Hedgerows destroyed which attract a large variety of birds and other wildlife I have seen badgers and monkjack deer in the surrounding woods .The disruption will see a decline in various wildlife. There are woodpeckers, treecreepers, owls etc. that will have their habitat destroyed.
776	8	4.Pollution will increase with extra traffic putting added pressure on highway maintenance.
776	9	5.Danger to school children from road traffic .
776	10	Yes open spaces should be protected for all the above reasons I have listed in question 3.
776	11	No
776	12	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
776	13	Existing sites should be developed. The travellers have already developed their communities in the current sites. Children and young people will have established friends and family in their existing sites and will have created a comfort zone.
776	14	Not sure
776	15	No
777	1	No, I believe all issues should be considered as different issues may be relevant to different people. And these plans will impact everyone in Worksop.
777	2	No, Worksop's population is already testing existing infrastructure.
777	3	I think location 35 is unsuitable.
777	4	No.
777	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
777	6	REMOVED
777	7	REMOVED
777	8	REMOVED
777	9	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35. This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.
777	10	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
777	11	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
777	12	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
777	13	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
777	14	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
777	15	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
777	16	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
777	17	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
777	18	I) Insufficient employment opportunities. Worksop does not provide enough employment opportunities for local people at current population levels, 700 additional homes will only make this situation worse leading to further unemployment within the local area.
777	19	J) Increase of teenage groups and crime. This is due to the lack of out of school activities made available for the several thousands of teenage Worksop residents. An additional 700 homes will undoubtedly make a current situation of teenage groups congregating on street corners and outside local shops even worse, this will cause distress to vulnerable and elderly residents.
778	1	My husband and I wish to register our objections to the proposed housing developments between Gateford and Carlton in Lindrick
778	2	Our reasons for this are as follows;- (1) the loss of green fields, woodlands, & farmland, with the subsequent blurring of the boundaries between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick,
778	3	(2) the impact on traffic levels on surrounding roads into Worksop that are already pretty heavy in rush hour as it is, which will bring

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
778	4	(3) extra pollution and noise from the increased traffic,
778	5	(4) the apparent unwillingness of the council to consider using brownfield sites instead, e.g. the ex Coats-Vyella site on High Hoe road, and the recently emptied plot along Kilton Road - between Kilton Hill and Eastgate, if the current landowners are being intransigent then CPO's should be considered on brownfield sites,
778	6	(5) the lack of employment in the surrounding area to support thousands of extra households,
778	7	(6) can the existing school and health services really cope with thousands of extra households?
779	1	I wish to register my concerns for the proposed developments around Tiln Lane and Bigsby Road areas in Retford. Mainly the road networks in Retford are not designed to take any further users. It used to take me five minutes to travel to my parents home (to care for them) now it can take upwards of fifteen minutes +., as all traffic has to go through the bottom of Moorgate. All back roads have been sealed off. The large lorries have to come through this area as there is no routes around the town, also school traffic has only one route. Surely any further development plans have to incorporate ring roads or connecting roads for the different areas of Retford.
780	1	We noticed with great concern the plans for the proposed building of more houses on Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road in Retford. While we appreciate the need for new homes we cannot agree that the sites proposed are good ones. Some additional problems would take place if it is given the go ahead.
780	2	The land suggested soaks up most of the run off water from the farm hills beyond it. Areas nearby have already suffered flooding after prolonged heavy rain. We all know that the change in the weather pattern in recent years must be taken into account now. Add to this the runoff from new roofs, driveways and new roads from the 600 dwellings proposed. The drains at the moment struggle to cope. The result would obviously be more flooded dwellings, also present homes losing value as insurance premiums would rise considerably. Who wants to buy a house in a flood threatened area?
780	3	Another problem would be the additional traffic - at least 600 more vehicles - in an already difficult area to access the London Road. During peak times and school run times we need to squeeze between double parked cars on our Avenue, Rose Avenue and Bracken Lane. The roads are not wide and are also bus routes. Imagine what it would be like with 600 more vehicles. At the moment we find that to reach town we need to turn left on London Road, then u turn at the Whitehouse's small roundabout to get into the flow of traffic. Any more vehicles would be a problem, never mind 600.
780	4	We would like to suggest the areas proposed be more useful to the environment and the community if developed into a wetland and maintained properly. The area could still catch the runoff and act as a soakaway, and also no additional harassment would be caused to the present occupants of this area.
781	1	I am very strongly opposed to housing or any other development on the Kilton Forest golf course and this land should definitely remain green open space.
781	2	My neighbours have also stated that they too are strongly opposing such housing developments on the Kilton Forest golf course and this land should definitely remain green open space.
781	3	All our neighbourhood and myself purchased our properties because of being next to the green open space.
782	1	I am writing to express my concern at the proposed housing developments in this area of the town. If agreed the character of this part of the town will be changed for the worse, as well as affecting wildlife in the area.
782	2	This is already a very busy area with excess traffic using Tiln Lane en route to Gainsborough to avoid the low bridge at Welham.
782	3	Carr Hill School situated in Tiln Lane has also to be considered as extra housing comes with extra traffic on the roads.
782	4	The Council must already be concerned with this as we have just had new traffic signs installed to try and slow vehicles down as they access the road near the school.
782	5	Another consideration is the infrastructure of the existing roads as already Moorgate is a death-trap at busy times of the day and the amount of new houses proposed would have a considerable effect on this, as extra traffic would have to use this route to access the town and surrounding areas.
782	6	I do feel brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed as we already have the empty school sites with prime building land standing idle and a poor sight on the landscape. Surely all this land has to be put to good use before developing good agricultural land which benefits the wildlife too.
782	7	I do hope the Council will very carefully consider its decision and what really is best for the town of Retford and not let money have an impact on the decision. Let us make use of what we already have and improve sites which have been set aside for housing and keep Retford the lovely market town that it is.
783	1	I am writing to express my concern at the proposed housing developments in this area of the town.
783	2	This is a very busy area of the town and existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope with the extra traffic this large amount of housing would inevitably bring to the town. This is already a very busy area with excess traffic using Tiln Lane en route to Gainsborough to avoid the low bridge at Welham.
783	3	The safety of the children must come first and we must avoid extra traffic on this road at all costs. It is already a bottleneck at school times and multiple dangers are evident here.
783	4	The character of this part of the town would be changes with this proposed housing development.
783	5	There are plenty of sites already earmarked for building and these brownfield sites should be used first before agreeing to planning on existing agricultural land.
783	6	The environment should be considered and the effects on wildlife.
783	7	Drainage has been a major problem for residents off Tiln Lane, especially since the development of Shetlands - you may remember the flooding of the property on Tiln Lane 2 years ago, which I'm sure would not have happened if the field had not been built on. These factors have to be considered as the more land we lose has an impact on existing properties.
783	8	The old school sites which are now lying derelict should be used before any other plans are agreed. They are an eyesore to the environment and residents living nearby. These need to be used and tidied up in an effort to keep Retford looking pristine and fetching to the eye for residents and forthcoming property owners.
783	9	Let us have the market town to be proud of and keep Retford tidy and give care and consideration to all factors before new plans are hastily agreed with repercussions and regret later.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
784	1	it has been brought to my attention that there are to be discussions proposing the development of houses north of Badgers Chase, Durham Grove etc. ... and wish to bring to your attention the following points.
784	2	The roads in that area would not hold the increased volume of traffic. Further traffic on Tiln Lane would cause danger to road users and pedestrians alike, especially school children and the people who pick them up. That area becomes very busy twice a day at school entry and exit times. There are no main roads off Moorgate or Welham Road suitable for carrying more traffic.
784	3	The proposal would take good agricultural land outside the borough boundary, also good wildlife areas with those of substantial trees and hedgerows. There must be other places more suitable for development within the existing development area which does not interfere with well established farm and wildlife friendly land.
784	4	There has been no consultation with residents.
784	5	This area has long been a place for residents of Retford to enjoy some peace and healthy exercise in their busy and stressful lives and it would be a dreadful mistake to deprive them of this necessity.
784	6	Living in the area I am of course opposed to the plan but apart from that I do think it is a bad idea for various reasons and hopefully you'll agree with me.
785	1	I know there is a national shortage of affordable housing but here in Retford and surrounding areas there are whole estates standing empty with no prospective occupiers in view. Just ask anyone who is trying to sell their house and they will let you know what low demand there is. Since Retford has lost most of its industry and commerce there is nothing to encourage outsiders to come here. Who is going to fill these houses?
785	2	How is the present infrastructure going to cope?
785	3	Tiln Lane/Smeath Lane are dangerous and totally unsuitable for any more traffic. My own daughter was knocked down by a large vehicle using Tiln Lane as a shortcut.
785	4	The number of HGVs using this road is increasing all the time.
785	5	Valuable agricultural land is being used while there are still many brownfield sites on the map and within existing boundaries.
785	6	Since we are talking about a substantial development, the need for a Welham/Clarborough bypass becomes even more pressing. By their past inaction NCC have encouraged the use of HGVs and altered the character of this area.
786	1	I am writing to express my concern at the proposed housing developments in this area of the town. If agreed the character of this part of the town will be changed for the worse, as well as affecting wildlife in the area.
786	2	This is already a very busy area with excess traffic using Tiln Lane en route to Gainsborough to avoid the low bridge at Welham.
786	3	Carr Hill School situated in Tiln Lane has also to be considered as extra housing comes with extra traffic on the roads.
786	4	The Council must already be concerned with this as we have just had new traffic signs installed to try and slow vehicles down as they access the road near the school.
786	5	Another consideration is the infrastructure of the existing roads as already Moorgate is a death-trap at busy times of the day and the amount of new houses proposed would have a considerable effect on this, as extra traffic would have to use this route to access the town and surrounding areas.
786	6	I do feel brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed as we already have the empty school sites with prime building land standing idle and a poor sight on the landscape. Surely all this land has to be put to good use before developing good agricultural land which benefits the wildlife too.
786	7	I do hope the Council will very carefully consider its decision and what really is best for the town of Retford and not let money have an impact on the decision. Let us make use of what we already have and improve sites which have been set aside for housing and keep Retford the lovely market town that it is.
787	1	I am writing to express my concern at the proposed housing developments in this area of the town. If agreed the character of this part of the town will be changed for the worse, as well as affecting wildlife in the area.
787	2	This is already a very busy area with excess traffic using Tiln Lane en route to Gainsborough to avoid the low bridge at Welham.
787	3	This extra use would have an effect on the environment plus be a safety issue past Carr Hill School. The road is extremely hazardous already at school times and the Council have had to put in calming traffic measures here recently to try to cope with existing traffic conditions. This is a road which cannot stand any increase in traffic.
787	4	I do feel brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed as we already have the empty school sites with prime building land standing idle and a poor sight on the landscape. Surely all this land has to be put to good use before developing good agricultural land which benefits the wildlife too.
787	5	I do hope the Council will very carefully consider its decision and what really is best for the town of Retford and not let money have an impact on the decision. Let us make use of what we already have and improve sites which have been set aside for housing and keep Retford the lovely market town that it is.
788	1	We are absolutely horrified at the scale of development BDC are proposing around the areas of Badgers Chase etc. ...
788	2	We object most strongly to the fact that there has been no consultation with residents about this proposal where the road infrastructure is really unsuitable for this major development.
788	3	The considered development will alter the whole character of the surrounding area beyond belief and the whole concept of Retford being a small market town.
788	4	There will be a considerable loss of good greenbelt agricultural land that will never be replaced in decades to come.. The world is short of food therefore it is insanity to build on yet more greenbelt land that could be producing food for the nation rather than biofuels.
788	5	There is a considerable amount of wildlife that will lose out yet again because of the need for housing that quite frankly Retford does not need.
788	6	Also the building will take place outside the existing development envelope.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
788	7	Before entering into this monumental decision by you, the Council, perhaps you should have considered the impact on lives of present residents, the use of all the brownfield sites should have been considered for development first. There have been numerous school sites as yet not developed and to this end these brownfield sites should be used before any greenbelt land extension of the town boundary is considered. There are also the factory sites that need consideration for building, however there are still a considerable number of homes that have been built recently and remain unoccupied.
788	8	Concerning the proposals for the development of Carr Hill School and its site, there is surely enough space to build a new school on the same site that the present school occupies without using greenbelt land.
788	9	We will be objecting strongly to any of the outline proposals to develop greenbelt land, especially around this area. We are astounded that yet again the Council do not listen to the people of this area and do not consider their feelings.
788	10	We question who will buy these houses in these austere times as the houses built in the last 5 years have not sold due to the recession. How do you expect people to buy a mass of property when Retford cannot entice growth of population due to no employers in the area?
789	1	Mortgages have been harder to obtain so who will be buying these houses?
789	2	Some companies are not able to sell existing properties that have just been built
789	3	Where are all the extra properties going to be drained to?
789	4	Loss of trees and hedges is interfering with wildlife
789	5	We were always prevented from bringing HGVs down smaller side roads, now you are allowing it. Causing way too much damage because of the increased weight that these lorries are now allowed to carry. In no time at all we will need local roads repairing. And at what cost?
789	6	No consultation with residents prior to production of proposal
789	7	The development would change the character of the area
789	8	The present road infrastructure is unsuitable for further development
789	9	Loss of good agricultural land.
789	10	Additional traffic congestion and danger to pedestrians and road users on Tiln Lane and surrounding roads
789	11	The proposed areas involve building outside the existing development envelope/the borough boundary.
789	12	There is still room to build on the old school sites
789	13	Also, there are the two old Elizabethan sites that could be built on, therefore tidying up these derelict sites.
789	14	All brownfield sites should be redeveloped first, before developing the edge of the town beyond the boundary.
790	1	The drainage in the Blackstope Lane area is very out-dated, its thin pipes being inadequate for the existing houses. I often come in to my bathroom to experience an unpleasant fusty smell from the drains - which permeates the whole bungalow. A friend of mine has, from time to time, used his own rods to clear drains between three properties.
790	2	Secondly, it was due to the fact that the land was so waterlogged in 2007 that floods rushed up from Grove Lane and Blackstope Lane. I was flooded out for 10 months. I attended meetings at the town hall when we leant heavily on the authorities to do everything possible to alleviate such a happening in the future. It could only be alleviation because we could not rule out a further occurrence of this situation.
790	3	No future housing development, please, in the area in question.
791	1	I am writing to object to the proposals for development of fields to the north of Badgers Chase and to the north east of Palmer Road, either side of Tiln Lane on the north side of Retford.
791	2	Having lived on Tiln Lane for 15 years I am constantly appalled by the volume and speed of lorries using this road, especially because Carr Hill School has two entrances on to Tiln Lane and children are in constant danger.
791	3	An increase in the volume of traffic will congest and worsen an already dangerous road. The infrastructure of the present road is unsuitable for such a development. I feel vibrations in my house when heavy lorries go past at the present time. To increase the traffic would make this much worse.
791	4	Since I have lived in Retford there has always been talk of diverting lorries from using Tiln Lane; this has not happened and I feel to increase the volume of traffic would be a huge backward step in maintaining the integrity and preserving the character of the area.
791	5	The area at the end of Bigsby Road will be a huge loss of agricultural land and again I worry as to where the site would have access.
792	1	I have had no information prior to these proposals
792	2	Infrastructure for the proposed development is very unsuitable.
792	3	Traffic on Tiln Lane is already very dangerous.
792	4	When I bought my property I was told it was on the greenbelt of Retford.
792	5	The Silver Birch Tree at the bottom of Palmer Road has a TPO
792	6	How can large vehicles go down Smeath Lane if another 900 homes are being built in the area.
792	7	Where are people going to work? With the demise of engineering and manufacturing jobs in the area everyone cannot work in a charity shop.
793	1	I am writing to offer my opinion in regard to the LDF consultation. I am particularly concerned about proposals for plot no. 35 which is immediately behind my home.

Reference number		Answer
Responde nt	Comme nt	
793	2	The proposal to build 700 houses on agricultural land is in conflict with national and local planning policy, as there is more than sufficient brownfield land available in the District. As I understand it brownfield land is considered as a priority before agricultural land.
793	3	The development would overlook my property and lead to loss of privacy, loss of view of open, rural elements, considerably devaluing my property.
793	4	traffic would significantly increase, threatening road safety and parking would become an issue, for at times the area is already very congested.
793	5	There would be a loss of historic trees and hedgerows, loss of habitat and damage to landscape.
793	6	There would be inadequate infrastructure to support the development e.g. school places and bus routes.
793	7	The marvellous views of much used, open, recreational space would completely change.
793	8	I am not an expert but I believe the concentration of surface water into the stream would at times pose a flood risk towards Carlton the out towards Blyth.
793	9	The project would do little to increase sustainable employment opportunities, which I understand is the Council's priority. All that would increase is the number of houses, the number of people competing for the same faculties and jobs.
793	10	There are several better sites to give adequate housing and commercial opportunity without destroying agricultural/recreational land. These are: 1) The old pits at Shireoaks, Firbeck and Manton; 2) The old factory site on High Hoe Road; 3)The old gas works on the canal; 4) The old Dorma site at Woodend; 5) The old Maltkins at Gateford Road; 6) Drill Hall on Shaw St; 7) The landfill sites at Turner Road and Ode Lane.
793	11	I have every confidence that common sense will prevail and that you will make every effort to utilise old industrial, spoilt land before taking away this source of joy and inspiration.
794	1	The development would extend beyond the existing development boundary on what has always been good agricultural land and at a time when brownfield sites are available for development.
794	2	The number of houses proposed by the development is out of all proportion to the size of the existing developed area.
794	3	Such a development would cause a detrimental alteration to the character of the area.
794	4	The effect of such a large development and the associated traffic it would generation the traffic congestion from Tiln Lane onto Moorgate, which the area already suffers from, would be considerable in addition to the lorries which already have to use Tiln Lane and Smeath Lane.
794	5	There are already several recently constructed housing developments in Retford with unsold/unlit properties and in view of the current concerns of the viability of proposed development especially as many of the major employment sites in town have now closed and been built on, there is little opportunity for employment in the town.
794	6	The Council appears to have learned nothing from its previous endeavours to provide such sites, i.e. Torworth and Leverton Road, both of which were wrecked and reduced to rubbish tips by the occupants who then abandoned the sites to be cleaned up by the Council, presumably using ratepayers' funds
795	1	We agree with the majority of the criteria in principle (however, it seems the complexity of the criteria may have been worded so as to outwit the average person) as long as they are strictly adhered to.
795	2	We believe site 9 should not be allowed to go ahead. Criterion 7 states this site would detract from the character of the area, as it is countryside which surrounds Manor Lodge which is a grade I listed Manor House of great significance (not shown on your map for some reason!).
795	3	For the same reason, criterion 8 - agricultural land and open spaces in rural areas should be protected as once they are developed they are lost forever, resulting in loss of wildlife.
795	4	Criterion 9 (2.40) the infrastructure is not adequate to join Mansfield Road as this is already a congested area. The cost of altering the infrastructure to support the extra housing would not be cost effective for the amount of housing it would provide.
795	5	We do not believe the town should be allocated more housing. This should be kept to a bare minimum, as we do not have sufficient schools, hospitals, policing, fire services etc. to support this. We do agree, however, to promotion of existing industrial areas that are already built and are currently standing empty. Surely a reduction in rates would encourage business which in turn would encourage employment. We need employment - manufacturing in Worksop before we have any further housing. If we have housing and no jobs this will result in more people to support on benefits, of which this area already has enough.
795	6	We believe sites 4 and W9 would be the best to use as the area is large enough to accommodate everything; housing, schools, shops, care home etc. Keeping it all in one place would be economically beneficial with enhancement to infrastructure etc. and cause minimum disruption to the rest of Worksop.
795	7	The areas surrounding proposed plots 9 and 30 should be protected as they provide a buffer zone which surrounds Manor Lodge, Lady Lea Nature Reserve and the bridleway that runs to Mansfield Road. This area is used by dog walkers, horse riders, cyclists etc. and provides a much needed escape from the built up estates. These areas should be protected, promoted and cleaned up, not built on as they provide shelter which promotes natural wildlife. if these areas are encouraged and not destroyed they could be a tourism asset - i.e. fishing and picnic areas, nature trails etc.
795	8	Development of these plots would be detrimental to wildlife and the beauty of the countryside and should be left as rural spaces.
795	9	has English Heritage been consulted over the development of plot 9? We are currently renovating Manor Lodge and have had to adhere to strict planning to be in keeping with the character and sympathetic to surrounding buildings - i.e. choice of material. Will the new housing on plot 9 be have to be built in the same way? If so, these will not be affordable housing.
795	10	Existing sites should be improved. No future sites should be developed - does not encourage economic growth.
796	1	Reference to the proposed building in the Bracken lane/Grove Coach Road area. It has come to my attention that planning permission is being submitted to build over six hundred houses on the site.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Responde nt	Comme nt	
796	2	I am a long-term resident of Blackstope lane and am very concerned about the possible new development. All can remember in 2007 our properties were extensively damaged by runoff floodwater from Grove Hills.
796	3	The Retford Beck channels all of this drainage down to the river Idle. Any more building development would mean excessive water down this system as concrete severely reduces ground soakage. Improvement to the existing system would be very costly and probably generate even more drainage problems in the low-lying areas.
796	4	I cannot imagine the traffic chaos on London Road.
796	5	Therefore myself and fellow residents strongly object to any of this madness. Once you have been flooded you can never forget the nightmare.
797	1	We strongly object to any housing development on the open land allocation number 39 this is a very nice green area.
797	2	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
797	3	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
797	4	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
797	5	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
797	6	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
797	7	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
797	8	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
797	9	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
797	10	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
797	11	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
797	12	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
797	13	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
797	14	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
797	15	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
797	16	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
797	17	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
797	18	Also the need for further medical facilities
797	19	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
797	20	Criteria 3: Can only-answered G to this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
797	21	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
798	1	I would like to put my objections forward for you to consider. My main concern is the flooding in this area, we have lived here for 12 years and my house is situated next to one of the fields in question. Every winter the garden is under water. We had extensive flooding in 2007, which resulted in a great deal of damage to my property. A flood protection scheme should be set up and nm for a minimum often to fifteen years to see if this works before anything could be considered. (Please see photographs of flooding at my property over the last 12 years.)
798	2	Entering London Road from Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane is a problem already, if the above were to happen there would be over 500 extra vehicles using these housing estate roads. Many of the houses on these roads have drives which cars have to reverse out of which would cause a road safety issue.
798	3	The Bracken Lane School is almost full to capacity and cannot be extended any further and once again during the winter the children cannot go on the playing field as it is water logged.
798	4	The area to be considered is home to lots of wildlife and many footpaths and walkways which we would loose.
798	5	Planning for houses in this area was turned down in 1995/6 because of all the above points so why should anything be different in 2012, has the weather climate improved?

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
799	1	Tiln Lane has always been a busy thoroughfare particularly as large lorries have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Claborough. More traffic would add to this. There is already severe congestion at the top of Moor gate Hill and along Tiln Lane when children are leaving and going to Carr Hill School.
799	2	The safety of children would be further compromised by additional traffic. How would this be addressed .
799	3	The roads in this area are not wide enough to take additional traffic particularly as homeowners often have to park their cars on the road. This is a particular problem during the evenings and weekends.
799	4	Roads in general in this area, i.e. Bigsby Road, Palmer Road, Richmond Road and Park Lane, will have a big increase in traffic passing through affecting the safety of pedestrians, not to mention the impact on homeowners' privacy and peace.
799	5	Dog walkers and bird watchers, etc., will be compromised by the additional traffic and building on the fields. Wildlife will gradually disappear as hedgerows and trees are felled to make way for housing.
799	6	We feel there are other areas in and around Retford which would be more suitable for building without loss of valuable countryside.
799	7	Additionally why do we need so many more new houses in Retford? The Estate Agents have many houses for sale on their books, as well as the new large development in Ordsall. Where are the potential buyers for these houses especially in a small market town like Retford.
799	8	We feel that the land adjacent to the Hop Pole Pub off Welham Road would be one of the most suitable sites as it would have less impact on nearby home owners and would provide relatively easy access to a main road with minimum disruption.
799	9	A second suitable site, in our opinion, would be land off the North Road in Retford which again would have easy access to a main road and would be limited disruption to current homes on the North Road Estate.
799	10	We feel proposals to build on land off Longholme Road would be detrimental in several ways. If building went ahead Longholme Road would have a massive increase in the volume of traffic as the access to these fields is at the bottom of Longholme Road and which would open up which is, at present, a quiet cul-de-sac.
799	11	Walkers who regularly walk these fields (and they are numerous from the outlying parts of this end of town) use the footpath at the bottom of Longholme Road and would be greatly compromised by the volume of traffic.
800	1	Tiln Lane has always been a busy thoroughfare particularly as large lorries have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Claborough. More traffic would add to this. There is already severe congestion at the top of Moor gate Hill and along Tiln Lane when children are leaving and going to Carr Hill School.
800	2	The safety of children would be further compromised by additional traffic. How would this be addressed .
800	3	The roads in this area are not wide enough to take additional traffic particularly as homeowners often have to park their cars on the road. This is a particular problem during the evenings and weekends.
800	4	Roads in general in this area, i.e. Bigsby Road, Palmer Road, Richmond Road and Park Lane, will have a big increase in traffic passing through affecting the safety of pedestrians, not to mention the impact on homeowners' privacy and peace.
800	5	Dog walkers and bird watchers, etc., will be compromised by the additional traffic and building on the fields. Wildlife will gradually disappear as hedgerows and trees are felled to make way for housing.
800	6	We feel there are other areas in and around Retford which would be more suitable for building without loss of valuable countryside.
800	7	Additionally why do we need so many more new houses in Retford? The Estate Agents have many houses for sale on their books, as well as the new large development in Ordsall. Where are the potential buyers for these houses especially in a small market town like Retford.
800	8	We feel that the land adjacent to the Hop Pole Pub off Welham Road would be one of the most suitable sites as it would have less impact on nearby home owners and would provide relatively easy access to a main road with minimum disruption.
800	9	A second suitable site, in our opinion, would be land off the North Road in Retford which again would have easy access to a main road and would be limited disruption to current homes on the North Road Estate.
800	10	We feel proposals to build on land off Longholme Road would be detrimental in several ways. If building went ahead Longholme Road would have a massive increase in the volume of traffic as the access to these fields is at the bottom of Longholme Road and which would open up which is, at present, a quiet cul-de-sac.
800	11	Walkers who regularly walk these fields (and they are numerous from the outlying parts of this end of town) use the footpath at the bottom of Longholme Road and would be greatly compromised by the volume of traffic.
801	1	Tiln Lane has always been a busy thoroughfare particularly as large lorries have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Claborough. More traffic would add to this. There is already severe congestion at the top of Moor gate Hill and along Tiln Lane when children are leaving and going to Carr Hill School.
801	2	The safety of children would be further compromised by additional traffic. How would this be addressed .
801	3	The roads in this area are not wide enough to take additional traffic particularly as homeowners often have to park their cars on the road. This is a particular problem during the evenings and weekends.
801	4	Roads in general in this area, i.e. Bigsby Road, Palmer Road, Richmond Road and Park Lane, will have a big increase in traffic passing through affecting the safety of pedestrians, not to mention the impact on homeowners' privacy and peace.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
801	5	Dog walkers and bird watchers, etc., will be compromised by the additional traffic and building on the fields. Wildlife will gradually disappear as hedgerows and trees are felled to make way for housing.
801	6	We feel there are other areas in and around Retford which would be more suitable for building without loss of valuable countryside.
801	7	Additionally why do we need so many more new houses in Retford? The Estate Agents have many houses for sale on their books, as well as the new large development in Ordsall. Where are the potential buyers for these houses especially in a small market town like Retford.
802	1	I am sure you have had lots of letters regarding this so I won't bore you with what my objections are other than to say you need to come and stand outside Carr Hill school at school opening and closing times and then imagine what it will be like with potentially another 1340 cars going either to work or ferrying children to school, factor in the articulated lorries -another accident waiting to happen.
803	1	I write to absolutely oppose even the idea of houses being situated in this area. Never in my life would I even have envisaged someone coming up with the idea of being able to build on that land which we look out over every single day. It never even crossed my mind this could possibly happen because it is pure open countryside for as far as the eye can see after the "new" Brixworth Way and Welham Grove" development. We thought then this would definitely be the outskirts of Retford for Good!!!
803	2	It is ludicrous to think that one house let alone 500 can be put on this unspoilt land, which we all thought was green belt.
803	3	It houses many different types of wildlife, including foxes and also has special scientific interest, the wildlife has been untouched for many years.
803	4	The scenery in this part of the world is breath-taking, and it is a pleasure to live where we are .
803	5	You will cause more problems than enough building in this area. People will move in droves from their homes and why should they, we bought these houses for where they are, LOCATION, LOCATION, LOCATION!!! Then some greedy landowners come up with the idea to spoil our life's, its beyond belief, this land will then be ruined for ever just for the sake of someone now making a quick buck. It is not on!!!!
803	6	The area noted, is liable to flooding. It is marshland and gets swamped even when there is only a little rain. The houses on Welham Grove are already subsiding as it is.
803	7	There are no access routes, services etc., roads, it would be chaos for the residents of this area to put up with all this upheaval of making this viable.
803	8	The congestion in Retford is unacceptable now so god only knows how it would sustain anymore houses.
803	9	I do not agree with the fact the Government needs to provide more housing for the future. Retford is full of new houses that have been built and have never been filled and there are plenty of older empty houses that just need renovating. There are plenty of houses available for people, plenty!!! Stop building for crying out loud. This country is going to rack and ruin because of overbuilding which is creating overcrowding of all our villages and towns. Retford used to be a lovely little market town and it is because of the Council and avaricious people that it is no longer that now and we will NEVER get this back, it is appalling.
804	1	As bungalow residents of Park Lane we are concerned to have had no formal notification or consultation of what appear to be immense developments of proposed housing in this area which will certainly change its entire character if other past developments in Bassetlaw are repeated in respect of density, height of the properties and effect upon the traffic if the present school runs are magnified.
804	2	The development of the road system in respect of the Welham low bridge has languished many years so we cannot expect any other necessary improvements to cope with the traffic these proposals will generate.
804	3	As Bungalow dwellers the loss of privacy and overlooking by three floor densely sited structures on tiny plots we would find objectionable.
804	4	It is regrettable that brown field sites are still available for development but no doubt these proposals are an easier option regardless of loss of good arable land.
804	5	In all we see an unconsented massive change to the character of the northern boundary of Retford being proposed without, at this stage, any practical benefit to whole of Retford which dearly needs to become more than a dormitory town.
805	1	The highways infrastructure in this area cannot sustain a significant increase in volumes of traffic, this development will bring. HGVs have to use the route down Tiln Lane to avoid a low bridge at Welham already a problem especially during school times outside Carr Hill School.
805	2	Much needed agricultural land will be lost, we should use the existing Brownfield sites in Retford first for any development
805	3	The character of this part of Retford will be changed for the worse due to this development.
805	4	The sites above are abundant with wildlife including protected species of Barn owls.
805	5	The development will bring additional safety issues for both road users and pedestrians, also there will be extra noise pollution in an area mainly populated with senior citizens.
805	6	There is not enough employment in the area to cater for a significant increase in population these developments will bring.
805	7	I am not against housing developments in the Retford area but feel either the existing Brownfield sites should be used first before Greenfield sites
805	8	If not then mixed used sites 51, R7, 259, R2 should be used to bring both housing and much needed employment into the area.
806	1	Some of the proposed sites are good agricultural land which we can ill afford to lose. Therefore all brownfield sites should be used first.
806	2	The proposed areas are outside the borough boundary and outside the current area for development.
806	3	Our strongest objections are on the grounds of safety. Any additional traffic would add to the existing problems along Tiln Lane. The road is used by a lot of heavy lorries that are forced to take Tiln Lane because of the height restrictions on the A620. Traffic already builds up at times on Tiln Lane. More traffic would increase the danger to the many pedestrians, including small children, who use this area.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
807	1	The character of the area will be massively altered
807	2	local infrastructure will be seriously strained
807	3	Traffic levels will hugely increase
807	4	A substantial loss of wildlife habitat
807	5	I moved to the area 6 years ago as it is a quiet, safe neighbourhood which I chose for my children to grow up in and I have paid a premium to do so.
807	6	In addition to my own perspective, there are public footpaths that the local community enjoy and these would also be lost.
807	7	Why ruin this area of natural beauty to build yet more houses in Retford when there are already so many new builds that are empty?
807	8	I would also add that the area has flooded on several occasions.
807	9	There is also a lack of jobs and industry in the area, so where are all the extra people going to be employed?
808	1	I think site 35 would be totally un-suitable, firstly for highway safety , No PROVISION'S HAVE BEEN LAID DOWN TO SUPPORT ALL THE EXTRA TRAFFIC ON ASHES PARK EXIT EITHER WAY
808	2	secondly there are no support for activities for the existing families or children already on this estate
808	3	I'm sure that the local school sited on this estate couldn't provide places for the in coming swell of children that this new proposal create
808	4	as a resident and driver on this estate want to register my resounding NO to this proposal.
808	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
809	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
809	2	Option A
810	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
810	2	Land that has no easy access, and is also infill ie Hidden Meadow on Low Street, which has a very narrow road with no footpath, no room for a meeting place which would mean the only passing place would be private driveways.
810	3	The proposed Finkle Street development. Access directly onto a two way road
810	4	The proposed development for six houses would mean an additional 12 cars needing access onto one of the narrower roads in Gringley
811	1	The criteria appears acceptable as listed, but its application is questionable as it does not appear to have been followed in respect of area/site 35.
811	2	No
811	3	Site 4/W9
811	4	I consider Site 35 as unsuitable for the following reasons The proposed development will overlook and houses along the northern edge of Holme Way, with an associated loss of privacy
811	5	The level of traffic generation associated with the proposed 700 additional dwelling is expected to lead to major congestion both in the immediate area, and in/out of Worksop along the two major axes that are Gateford Road (B6041) and Carlton Road (A60).
811	6	The 2 exits at the opposed ends of Ashes Park Avenue are T-junctions onto the 2 major northern traffic axes in and out of Worksop, and the additional traffic from the proposed development is expected to create significant congestion in and out of Worksop at any given time, but more particularly at rush hour
811	7	The exit of Ashes Park Avenue onto Gateford Road is already severely problematic at rush hour, during term time, with queuing traffic stretching daily from the Gateford Road junction back to at least Alexander Drive and, increasingly frequently, back to Churchill Way.
811	8	Moreover, and notwithstanding the above, the level of traffic associated with the proposed 700 additional dwellings would create severe merging problems with the A57 at the level of the B6041/A57 joining roundabout
811	9	Worksop, and particularly the Gateford Park areas at its northern edge, is an inherent part of the Sheffield commuter belt today. An increasing number of dwellers local to the proposed development commute along the A57 every day, resulting in daily traffic flow problems between Worksop and Junction 31 of the M1 that are well known to relevant planning services of both Nottinghamshire and South Yorkshire. As no solution to these problems is currently forthcoming, the proposed development would simply amplify these problems
811	10	The smaller roundabout between the only proposed exit for the new development, Churchill Way, and both Ashes Park Avenue and Fairfax Avenue is not suitable to accommodate the level of traffic associated with the proposed 700 additional dwellings, as exit from existing housing via Fairfax Avenue will become severely congested.
811	11	The proposed development will remove long-established hedgerows which currently divide the field bordered by Whipman Wood and Nab's Ashes Wood, and which currently serve as habitat for very diverse wildlife including pheasants and various birds of prey, notably peregrine falcon
811	12	The proposed development will also result in a loss of ecological habitats, because the building and occupation of houses up to boundary of Whipman Wood and Nab's Ashes Wood will drive current fauna away, which currently includes deers, pheasants, woodpeckers, weasels and various birds of prey, notably peregrine falcon
811	13	Considering the proposed number of dwellings and their social housing purpose, the density and mass of buildings is expected to increase policing and council servicing requirements very significantly, in an area currently diametrically - opposed (geographically, relative to the overall Worksop area) to the base current location of such resources, with all the traffic and access restrictions already noted above

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
811	14	The proposed use of the site is entirely incompatible with existing neighbouring land uses. Besides cultivation purposes, the proposed area is extensively used by inhabitants of Gateford Park estate (and further afield, who park daily on Churchill Way) for countryside walks and bird spotting, and is well known as a beauty spot for such purposes. Owday Wood and parts of the woods surrounding the proposed area are used on a near-daily basis for shoots, and have been for very many years
811	15	The local infrastructure is also entirely inadequate to support the development. The 2 schools within the catchment area of the proposed development are already very substantially over-subscribed and could not possibly support the amount of children expected from the proposed 700 additional dwellings. There are no retail or council services of any sort in proximity to the proposed development.
811	16	There is also a substantial flood risk for the proposed dwellings that would be located nearer Holme Way, as the brook located between Ashes Park Avenue and Holme Way floods the grass field towards existing Holme Way dwellings with increasing frequency and increasing amplitude every passing year. This is an on going concern, which requires preventative or remedial action irrespective of the proposed development.
811	17	Site 4/W9. Employment should be developed in parallel with housing on the same site, in order to promote at least partly self-sustaining micro-economy zones which lessen infrastructural requirements (particularly road network).
811	18	Site 4/W9. The town should develop to the east in order to balance the traffic axes, town centre amenities, and Bassetlaw hospital location relative to conurbation spread
811	19	Option B: Focused in just one of the above towns
811	20	Existing sites. New council housing corresponds to the requirement of the majority of inhabitants, addressing this requirement with new locations should take precedence over the needs of the few, who expectedly have a much lesser land/geographical requirement.
812	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable. There is a real issue of the rise in traffic from such a large scale development
812	2	The local school, shops, facilities in general would not be able to cope. The building of such a development should be elsewhere, if at all.
812	3	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
812	4	NO.
813	1	The criteria appears acceptable as listed, but its application is questionable as it does not appear to have been followed in respect of area/site 35
813	2	No
813	3	Site 4/W9.I consider Site 35 as unsuitable for the following reasons. The proposed development will overlook and houses along the northern edge of Holme Way, with an associated loss of privacy
813	4	The level of traffic generation associated with the proposed 700 additional dwelling is expected to lead to major congestion both in the immediate area, and in/out of Worksop along the two major axes that are Gateford Road (B6041) and Carlton Road (A60).
813	5	The 2 exits at the opposed ends of Ashes Park Avenue are T-junctions onto the 2 major northern traffic axes in and out of Worksop, and the additional traffic from the proposed development is expected to create significant congestion in and out of Worksop at any given time, but more particularly at rush hour.
813	6	The exit of Ashes Park Avenue onto Gateford Road is already severely problematic at rush hour, during term time, with queuing traffic stretching daily from the Gateford Road junction back to at least Alexander Drive and, increasingly frequently, back to Churchill Way
813	7	Moreover, and notwithstanding the above, the level of traffic associated with the proposed 700 additional dwellings would create severe merging problems with the A57 at the level of the B6041/A57 joining roundabout. Worksop, and particularly the Gateford Park areas at its northern edge, is an inherent part of the Sheffield commuter belt today. An increasing number of dwellers local to the proposed development commute along the A57 every day, resulting in daily traffic flow problems between Worksop and Junction 31 of the M1 that are well known to relevant planning services of both Nottinghamshire and South Yorkshire. As no solution to these problems is currently forthcoming, the proposed development would simply amplify these problems
813	8	The smaller roundabout between the only proposed exit for the new development, Churchill Way, and both Ashes Park Avenue and Fairfax Avenue is not suitable to accommodate the level of traffic associated with the proposed 700 additional dwellings, as exit from existing housing via Fairfax Avenue will become severely congested.
813	9	The proposed development will remove long-established hedgerows which currently divide the field bordered by Whipman Wood and Nab's Ashes Wood, and which currently serve as habitat for very diverse wildlife including pheasants and various birds of prey, notably peregrine falcon.
813	10	The proposed development will also result in a loss of ecological habitats, because the building and occupation of houses up to boundary of Whipman Wood and Nab's Ashes Wood will drive current fauna away, which currently includes deers, pheasants, woodpeckers, weasels and various birds of prey, notably peregrine falcon
813	11	Considering the proposed number of dwellings and their social housing purpose, the density and mass of buildings is expected to increase policing and council servicing requirements very significantly, in an area currently diametrically - opposed (geographically, relative to the overall Worksop area) to the base current location of such resources, with all the traffic and access restrictions already noted above

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
813	12	The proposed use of the site is entirely incompatible with existing neighbouring land uses. Besides cultivation purposes, the proposed area is extensively used by inhabitants of Gateford Park estate (and further afield, who park daily on Churchill Way) for countryside walks and bird spotting, and is well known as a beauty spot for such purposes. Owday Wood and parts of the woods surrounding the proposed area are used on a near-daily basis for shoots, and have been for very many years.
813	13	The local infrastructure is also entirely inadequate to support the development. The 2 schools within the catchment area of the proposed development are already very substantially over-subscribed and could not possibly support the amount of children expected from the proposed 700 additional dwellings. There are no retail or council services of any sort in proximity to the proposed development.
813	14	There is also a substantial flood risk for the proposed dwellings that would be located nearer Holme Way, as the brook located between Ashes Park Avenue and Holme Way floods the grass field towards existing Holme Way dwellings with increasing frequency and increasing amplitude every passing year. This is an on going concern, which requires preventative or remedial action irrespective of the proposed development.
813	15	Site 4/W9. Site 4/W9. Employment should be developed in parallel with housing on the same site, in order to promote at least partly self-sustaining micro-economy zones which lessen infrastructural requirements (particularly road network).
813	16	Site 4/W9. The town should develop to the east in order to balance the traffic axes, town centre amenities, and Bassetlaw hospital location relative to conurbation spread.
813	17	Yes
813	18	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
813	19	Existing sites. New council housing corresponds to the requirement of the majority of inhabitants, addressing this requirement with new locations should take precedence over the needs of the few, who expectedly have a much lesser land/geographical requirement.
813	20	Together. Same reasons as 121
814	1	The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) was published in September 2011 in line with PPS3 and identifies potential housing land. Everton has been included in this document and is recognised as a Rural Service Centre. Site 405 was deemed to be 'suitable' as the site offers a suitable location for development and 'achievable' as there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be delivered. For the avoidance of doubt as to whether the site is 'available', the landowner has expressed an intention to ensure the land is developed should the site be deemed acceptable for housing.
814	2	The site is an area of 5.7 hectares (14.08 acres) and is currently used for the purpose of agriculture. It is situated on the edge of the settlement fronting the A631 with previously developed associated housing opposite. Although, due to the Council's density calculation, the site has been deemed suitable for 154 units, it is proposed that only part of the site be allocated and submitted into the Preferred Options document in line with the potential housing requirement in Everton, i.e. 13 properties. The northern area fronting the A631 (Bawtry Road) is most likely to be suitable if this was the case.
814	3	An area of archaeological interest has been identified north of the proposed site, but is deemed to be located outside of the site itself on a different area of land. The development of the site is not thought to have an adverse effect on the protection and conservation of this other area.
814	4	The plan below is provided by the Environment Agency as an indication of those areas at risk of flooding (diagram given). The area illustrated clearly shows that there is little or no risk of flooding on the proposed site. In any case, it is anticipated that if developed, it will be in the site's best interest to ensure that the run-off rate is maintained so as to attenuate surface water utilising Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) in line with Planning Policy Statement 25 for England on Development and Flooding.
814	5	Access is deemed suitable and convenient with the main highway serving the village being situated directly adjacent to the proposed site. Any highway requirements are anticipated to be met should the site be allocated into the Bassetlaw Site Allocations DPD.
814	6	Everton is extremely popular with commuters to both North Nottinghamshire and South Yorkshire as well as further afield. The village is considered to be attractive and any future development on the site will seek to enhance this. House prices in the village have proven to be less volatile when compared to other areas in the locality.
814	7	In line with the Core Strategy, the proposed site is considered to be only suitable for housing due to Everton being a Rural Service Centre. However, there is scope for a potential unit to be allocated as a Village Shop if necessary as a means to enhance the sustainability and economic development of the village. Public consultation has revealed that demand for such a provision is strong.
814	8	Due to convenient location of the proposed site being a small extension on the edge of the village, this will allow minimal disruption to the settlement as a whole. Should the necessary traffic associated with the development of the site approach from the West, potentially there is no reason why any should enter the village at all.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
814	9	Public opinion was originally mixed when gauging support for the site, however this became much more favourable and stronger when it was explained to local residents that although the whole field had been submitted for consideration, based on the housing need in Everton, only part of the site was likely to be allocated. Although our independent consultations could be considered, it is appreciated that the Council's own processes and Issues and Options Consultation Paper will be the base of any conclusions and consequential decisions going forward. Our own findings and views appear to be very much in line with the Council's own feedback from their 'Future Development Questionnaire' that was delivered to 318 households. It would appear that 2 and 3 bedroom properties are most favourable, as are bungalows. Should the site be allocated, the site would be viable to deliver both of these identified housing types i.e. 2/3 bedroom bungalows, should the Council deem this acceptable. Obviously, due to the suitability of the site, it would prove itself ideal to a range of different housing should this be preferable. Similar to the Council's own investigations, it would appear that public opinion does not view farmland as a community asset worthy of protection as only one respondent viewed this as important. The proposed site, being agricultural land, would therefore be a strong site for adoption based on this criterion. Based on the Council's traffic light system, we would agree that it would be true to say that there is some (amber) community support for the development of the site, however compared to the concerns that have been highlighted in relation to other sites in the village it could be regarded that the site has strong (green) support.
814	10	The vast majority of Everton village is made up of residential dwellings. Therefore, existing public amenity is compatible with the occupation of the new proposed development site. Factors such as noise, odour, light and privacy are consistent with what has already historically been established within the village. There is a farm and associated land to the immediate west, east and south of the site. It is proposed that only part of the current site be adopted as suitable for housing, meaning that the majority of the site be preserved as farmland, therefore continuing to complement the immediate surroundings. To the north, previously developed land has been established in the formation of various dwellings fronting the A631 together with the construction of Long Meadows. Such land use is also compatible with the proposed site as it is only likely that the northern sector of the site be deemed suitable for adoption. Therefore, due to the northern area of the site proving compatible and consistent to the similar neighbouring land to the north, together with the remaining land most likely to remain as open countryside similar to the rest of the neighbouring land that surrounds it, the site is deemed to be compatible (green) with existing and proposed uses.
814	11	As previously mentioned in 3.8 above, public consultation has revealed the preference to have a shop established within the village, as was confirmed at the public consultation meeting held in Everton Village Hall on Saturday 19th November 2011. Currently, the nearest shopping facilities are located in Mattersey which is not conveniently located for those without transportation. The size, suitability and versatility of the site allows for the possibility of a mixed-use scheme to be developed that would not only meet housing requirements, but also establish employment and an identified local amenity that is currently lacking. As previously mentioned in 3.7 above, Everton is popular with commuters. Through allowing the site to be adopted would accommodate more contributors to the wider economic development within the District. Lack of suitable homes for those seeking employment locally would prove to have a detrimental effect on the future economic growth within the District. Based on a single use residential scheme, this would mean that economic development will continue as is current (amber), although a mixed-use scheme, identifying the need for a Village Shop and/or Post Office would lead to the delivery (green) of economic development opportunities.
814	12	It has been accepted by the Council that a significant amount of development between now and 2028 will be on greenfield land and it is understandable that the impact on the most valuable agricultural land can be minimised where possible. The proposed site is not deemed to be 'valuable' when considering it is of poor agricultural quality. PPS7 recommends that Natural England's Agricultural Land Classification should be taken into account when considering development of greenfield land. In this case, the site falls into Grade 3b. Although Bassetlaw are unable to differentiate between 3a and 3b, the assessment criteria is such that all grade 3 sites are considered equally of the same quality and therefore falls within (amber) impact on grade 3, 4 or 5 agricultural land.
814	13	It is recognized by the Council that the majority of Bassetlaw's major settlements are in a SPZ. Similarly, part of Everton is also in such a zone. The proposed site is conveniently placed in the lowest classified zone, this being Zone 3. Development is therefore likely to have a minimal effect on the provision of either drinking water for residents or the area's ecology. Due to the zone in which the Environment Agency has classified the proposed site, development will have little or no impact on groundwater and water source extraction. Due to the distance of the site from the nearest extraction point there is very little risk of contamination, although mitigation will be implemented to ensure any risk is lowered even further should the site be approved for development. Based on the Council's traffic light system, the proposed site is deemed to be within Source Protection Zone 3 (amber). However, housing is not considered by the Environment Agency as a polluting activity and it is proposed that the prospective use of the site should warrant it's classification to be treated more favourably.
814	14	Policy DM9 within the Core Strategy recognises the importance of protecting the District's landscape. Site 405 is within Idle Lowlands Policy Zone 04: Conserve and Reinforce (amber). The landscape is therefore recognised as requiring further reinforcement and is not seen as being of the most sensitive Character Zone where mere conservation is needed. Therefore, the proposed new development would seek to ensure an appropriate scheme would introduce reinforced or enhanced landscape features.
814	15	It is proposed that future development of the site will be undertaken in such a way that the design and layout will be in line with already established newly built housing within the village. It is important as well to ensure that any newly constructed units do not detract from older properties elsewhere within the locality. Therefore, the future proposed development of the site will seek to enhance (green) the existing built form of the settlement.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
814	16	Natural England is promoting the concept of Green Infrastructure as a way to deliver a wide range of benefits for people and the natural environment together. Their policy complements that of the Council's in that they endeavour to ensure that Green Infrastructure is delivered via the spatial planning system, as an integral part of new development. Natural England define Green Infrastructure as a strategically planned and delivered network of high quality green spaces and other environmental features. It should be designed and managed as a multifunctional resource capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities. Green Infrastructure includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, allotments and private gardens. The proposed site is currently not delivering any such network and is not classified as a Local Wildlife Site, nor does it include any woodland. However, the suitability of the site enables new housing to have the potential for private gardens and/or allotments. Such features would seek to support natural and ecological processes and are deemed integral to the health and quality of the sustainable community. There is further potential, when consulting with developers should the site be adopted, to consider whether a Section 106 agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 might become relevant. This would mean there is scope for other areas of the client's land to be designated as recreational areas or Public Open Space. Development of the site, therefore, is highly likely to enhance (green) existing Green Infrastructure within the village.
814	17	As previously mentioned in 2.3 above, the landowner has displayed a strong intention to see the site developed, hence his instruction for the formulation of this comments report. Therefore, the site is deemed to be 'available' pending planning permission and allocation into the DPD. It is recommended to our client that should the site be successfully considered in the Preferred Options document then consultations with specialist Planning Consultants and a Developer will aid in the allocation into the DPD. It is worth noting that as there is an assumption by the Council for the site to be delivered within the next 6-10 years, allowing enough time, with the aid of Developer input, to gain planning consent for the implementation of new housing within this time frame. Any further constraints relating to highway requirements and local infrastructure will be addressed proactively and in accordance with standard practice when considering possible Community Infrastructure Levies and Section 106 agreements (see 11.4). The District Council's own assessment of the site reveals within the 'Final Assessment Comments' section that 'there are no known constraints which would prevent the site from being suitable for housing development', with any provisos being addressed above. Therefore, the site has no existing constraints (green).
814	18	The above comments seek to address the criteria by which the proposed site will be considered for the second formal round of consultation, the Preferred Options report. Its structure and content has been drawn up in such a way as to ensure the comments above are rational and impersonal and primarily address planning policy. It is understood that the following assessment of the Issues and Options Consultation Paper carried out by the Council will allow reasoned decisions to be made based on the above criteria and all comments included within this report can be made publically available. The above comments and representations will be forwarded directly to the Planning Inspector responsible for examining the finished document.
815	1	I would oppose any such development on the following grounds, Ruining aspect views I have from the side and front of my property.
815	2	Devaluing the value of my property
815	3	Loss of a valuable local leisure resource
815	4	Local infrastructure unable to cope with a large increase in local population.
816	1	I have just had a visit from a concerned resident telling me about a proposed NEW development which I knew nothing about. How can this happen in this day and age with so many ways of informing people about such a devastating development? I am at this time reading a letter which I will be signing and sending off. This letter mentions the WILDLIFE in this area. My wife and I moved here some years ago now and we use to sit in our back garden in the summer months and listen to the SKYLARKS that nested in fields not to far from our front door. But alas never to be heard again. So please do your utmost to stop this development from spreading again. I have since heard a FOX calling for a mate and A Tawny Owl calling in the night. Please let them continue living here as that was why I moved from East London in the late 80s. We as a FAMILY love the wildlife and the countryside.
816	2	This development cannot be good for them or us as it will increase the traffic flow, whilst destroying their homes. We have had a number of CAR Crashes at the bottom of Lancaster Walk. The last one required a large amount of Emergency services to deal with the injured people in the cars, including children.
817	1	More employment growth.
817	2	Location 35 is unsuitable for development
817	3	All open spaces should be protected from development
817	4	more employment growth is required. not housing growth. there are not enough employers in the town to accommodate the unemployed that Worksop already has. More houses means more people potentially looking for work in the area that cannot provide it.
817	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
817	6	sites should be kept around existing sites. Its easier to manage and police when travellers are in the same area
817	7	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
817	8	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
817	9	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
817	10	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
817	11	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
817	12	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
817	13	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
817	14	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
818	1	No
818	2	I think Site 35 is unsuitable due to traffic issues, local amenities not being sufficient for 700 more homes, not enough places at schools. Loss of agricultural land
818	3	Away from Gateford where traffic issue are already critical
818	4	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
819	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable development
819	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
819	3	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
819	4	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
819	5	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
819	6	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area.
819	7	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
819	8	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
819	9	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
819	10	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
820	1	The figures used in the Gypsy and Traveller section do not seem to relate to the EMRP, where a minimum of 25 residential pitches were required to 2012, along with 18 transit pitches. Since 5 residential pitches have been provided, this leaves 20 residential pitches and 18 transit to 2012. This is also the finding of the Nottinghamshire GTAA Update 2010 (page 18). Also, since the evidence base dates from 2005, it would appear that a new GTAA should be conducted in order that there is a robust and sound evidence base. However in order to avoid further delay, then the figures of 20 and 18 should be used as the minimum figures (albeit they are to 2012 and there is no estimate of need arising beyond that time - a rough estimate could be gained by applying a 3% compound growth rate which reveals a need for an additional 50 residential pitches 2012 - 2028). The location of new sites should be discussed with local Gypsies and Travellers, but will largely be guided by the core strategy policy. Just as mainstream housing is not delivered in a uniform manner across the district, it is unlikely that it would be appropriate to deliver Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation evenly across the district.
820	2	Small, private, family sites tend to be favoured by the Gypsy and Traveller community, and these should be provided separately to transit provision. Some transit provision may be appropriate, for example where it relates to accommodation for visitors, on residential sites. Successful transit sites need to be managed in a different way to residential sites, so the two do not always go together.
821	1	Site no: 35 Potential housing in Gateford I would like to object to this proposal on the grounds that the amount of traffic in this area is at saturation point. The junction of A57/Ashes Park Ave is the major exit route from the North side of the Gateford estate and on the South side Kingfisher Walk/A57. More housing would mean even more traffic as all properties in Gateford have at least 2 vehicles.
821	2	Option A
822	1	Yes

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
822	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
822	3	Yes, more affordable housing is needed
822	4	410 is the preferred site to redevelop
822	5	Yes, the school should be protected
822	6	Yes, this site should be redeveloped for housing
823	1	Development of Sandy Lane into future housing.
823	2	I believe site 35 is wholly unsuitable for development into future housing. This space is presently beautiful open countryside and an asset to those living in Gateford as a public amenity. The area is used by dog walkers, families, cyclists and nature-spotters and is a jewel in the crown of Gateford, which has no facilities for recreation
823	3	Removing this would encourage anti social behaviour and increase traffic flow
823	4	pollution and put a strain on this area, not least disrupt the wildlife and ruin what is now an asset.
823	5	Yes. Wholeheartedly. Worksop and area has so few beautiful open spaces, it would be devastating to lose them
823	6	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
824	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
824	2	Option A
825	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable for 700 houses, I don't think the infrastructure is suitable for that size of development
825	2	Consideration should be given for a smaller number of houses or upgraded infrastructure not affecting the Ashes Park Road network
825	3	All open spaces should be protected
825	4	Tesco's should not have been given permission to build on the new plot off Carlton Road - this should have remained Open Space
825	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
826	1	No. You should be using brown field sites and not green field sites
826	2	Worksop does need more affordable housing which is located nearer to amenities and public transport links
826	3	Not location 35 as it's green field and forms a natural green belt to the North of Worksop/Gateford
826	4	Yes
826	5	Access to and from Gateford (via Ashes Park ave or by Edison Park Ave) is already a nightmare at peak times - the vehicles from the proposed extra of 700 dwellings would not be acceptable
826	6	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
827	1	Location 35 is unsuitable
827	2	Option A
828	1	Location 35 is unsuitable
828	2	Option A
829	1	I do not think that appropriate consideration has been given to the criteria number 2.6.
829	2	Yes the criteria looks good on paper but in reality when viewing the sites for development, especially site 35, no consideration has been given to the following - 3. Protected species and Local Wildlife Sites 4. Access to the site and local road network capacity 5. Levels of access to key services and facilities 14. Highways access 8. Ancient woodlands 9. Local Nature Reserves 6. Protected trees 7. Protected species
829	3	I believe the priority of Bassetlaw District Council should be in regard to employment growth as this in turn will alleviate many of the problems the town has suffered from for many years such as - unemployment, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, petty crime, drug related crimes, poor levels of education
829	4	I believe site 35 is wholly unsuitable for development for housing in the future
829	5	The estate already in existence that will border this proposed development has too high a level of through traffic on Ashes Park Avenue/Eddison Avenue from commuters trying to take short cuts rather than approach the traffic lights at the Cannon Public House junction.
829	6	The three primary schools in the immediate proximity to this area (St John's, Gateford Park, Redlands) are already over subscribed. New housing proposals of 700 homes is likely to bring with it at least 1000 children. Where will these children receive their primary schooling?
829	7	The area proposed for the new housing development is currently used by locals for walking their dogs and for family leisure walks. Our children have enjoyed having local fauna and wildlife so near to their home which is part of their life education. All of this will be taken away for them and future generations
829	8	The local emergency services are reducing in numbers and a housing development of 700 homes will probably bring with it at least 1800 people which will be a further drain on our already limited services
829	9	I believe that a current open space which has been allocated for future development (site 35) should remain an open site. When we moved to this area in 2003 we were informed that, in accordance with local searches, that no further development was to take place on this estate.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
829	10	Bassetlaw District Council has failed to take in to consideration an already heavily populated and under serviced area when considering plans for a further large development (site 35). The extra traffic to and through the estate already in existence will increase the risk residents already face from through traffic wishing to avoid poorly managed traffic controls at the Cannon Public House crossroads.
829	11	Site 35 should be a protected site, remaining open and undeveloped land
829	12	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
829	13	No further new sites should be developed within the District
829	14	Together
830	1	Have no idea what this means- all jargon
830	2	Option B
830	3	No, the parish plan said NO more buildings
830	4	None
830	5	Your previous check box of no. houses people wanted was 0-5. People who ticked that thinking that meant 0 have been misrepresented with BDC stating 0-5 means 5. You deliberately misled people using this question
830	6	Yes, we need to protect our village from creepage and urban sprawl
830	7	No
830	8	Separate
830	9	Not in Sutton
831	1	Yes
831	2	No - if anything there is too much.
831	3	Any except Site 4 and W9 which consist of significant areas currently used as a golf course and for recreation. There would be a disproportional effect on the local transport infrastructure from such major development, both in the short and long term.
831	4	Any except Site 4 and W9 which consist of significant areas currently used as a golf course and for recreation. There would be a disproportional effect on the local transport infrastructure from such major development, both in the short and long term.
831	5	Any except Site 4 and W9 which consist of significant areas currently used as a golf course and for recreation. There would be a disproportional effect on the local transport infrastructure from such major development, both in the short and long term
831	6	Yes, however there is a distinct lack of protection of any sizeable area in the north-east, retention of at least the golf course area even if only as open parkland with some play areas would be better.
831	7	No
831	8	If Site 4/W9 were to be used, protection of the current golf course area is favoured, with any employment use concentrated to the south east abutting Rayton Lane beyond the sewage works
831	9	However better protection of the amenity value the Ryton Valley and Chesterfield Canal predicates against this.
831	10	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
831	11	Preference is for around existing sites to retain closeness of access for those traveller who have relatives/friends using existing locations. This could help to minimise management costs
831	12	Provision should be together to allow ease of management and potentially minimise cost to the community
831	13	No
832	1	Yes
832	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
832	3	Yes
832	4	410
832	5	Yes they should be protected.
832	6	Yes this should be a priority.
832	7	Existing sites
832	8	None
833	1	Yes
833	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
833	3	Yes and cheaper houses for younger people
833	4	Site 228 is the best for housing

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
833	5	Primary school is only half full
833	6	Yes the new play area should be protected from housing.
833	7	Existing
833	8	Separate
834	1	Yes it is sufficient
834	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes
834	3	No, the detention centre development is more than enough
834	4	No more housing
834	5	Too much traffic onto the main bypass
834	6	Yes, i agree these should be kept
835	1	Yes
835	2	NO - the current allocation seems very high anyway.
835	3	Any except Site 4 & W9.
835	4	Any except Site 4 & W9
835	5	Any except Site 4 & W9. A large portion of this site is currently used for public open air recreation and therefore its use for development would be detrimental to the area.
835	6	I agree with those identified on the plan but as stated in my response to Q5 a large part of Site 4/W9 is currently used for public recreation and this at least, if not the whole area, should be retained as such.
835	7	None
835	8	In the event of Site 4/W9 being selected for some development, additional consideration must be given to how use of the southern portion overlooking the Ryton and Canal impacts this strip of land that is at present part of an important broad green gateway running towards the town centre
835	9	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
835	10	Continued use of existing sites is preferable, with any expansion to meet new requirements adjacent. This would help to keep management and maintenance costs lower.
835	11	By reason of helping to keep costs down co-location would be most practical.
835	12	No
836	1	Yes - criteria seem reasonable
836	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
836	3	I strongly disagree. I understand that the factory site has been approved with 41 new houses. There are another 26 existing planning permissions.
836	4	The village infrastructure can't support more development; it will struggle to cope with the development at the factory site and the existing permissions.
836	5	None
836	6	Yes
836	7	Existing sites, preferably expanded if possible as shortfall is relatively small
836	8	Preferably together to minimise number of sites
837	1	No
837	2	No the town cannot take anymore
837	3	None
837	4	None
837	5	No
837	6	None
837	7	All should be protected
837	8	No
837	9	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
838	1	NO. The methodology has been one of intimidation. The Parish were involved in a major consultation culminating in the Parish Plan, and in 2010 Bassetlaw again set about another consultation with total disregard to the previous work. It seems that the planning office are already being influenced by other forces without any regard for the views of the parish. Planning offices will never be rid of the stigma of fraud and corruption whilst ever they go against such strong opinion. There is no credible argument for further building in the parish of Sutton.
838	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
838	3	No - No more land should be destroyed for building.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
838	4	The residents surveys did not state 4 houses would be acceptable. The way in which the planning department calculated the figures is completely wrong. They have used the top figure of every bracket, i.e. 0-10 they used 10 as the agreeable figure. They could have just as easily used 1 as the figure or of course if they were genuinely unbiased they would have used the centre point i.e.5. By using the centre point figure across all the question the actual figure deemed acceptable by the residents is actually 0.8 houses. The planning officer who have attended the village meetings and council meetings have already admitted that the negative response from Sutton is amongst the strongest they have ever had. The answer is NO MORE HOUSING
838	5	NO MORE HOUSING IN SUTTON is required or justifiable
838	6	Sutton has had extensive housing development over the past 35 years. Two interlinked housing estates, and a separate cul-de-sac for which an 18th century farm and farm house were demolished to make way for it, are all part of the legacy Bassetlaw planning department have imposed on Sutton. This has completely changed the demographics of the parish, which is no just a dormitory for commuters traveling to large towns and cities beyond. The influx of such numbers of non rural residents has diluted the community feel and integration with most not wanting to actively integrate in rural life. Building on the last green spaces in the village further destroys the demographics of the village by reducing the opportunity for people to buy properties with the opportunity to have a small holding or to keep stock and grow their own food. The last remaining pieces of land inside the village envelope either belong to larger properties, or are redundant land bought as investment opportunities. The parish are not even able to provide allotments to its parishioners because ever scrape of open space has been bought up by speculative capitalist waiting for more favourable planning conditions. It is totally wrong that the parish is held to ransom in this way, and planning should not find in there favour just because they have bought it as a speculative investment. If they invested in the markets and they lost out that's the gamble, and land should be no different, there should be no presumption in favour of the developer.
838	7	All open space within the parish whether on the map or not, and irrespective of ownership, now needs protecting to stop further speculative investors trying to build on paddocks and gardens. This village once had at least 7 farms within its curtilage, now there are none, and the last remaining small holding is currently under threat of the planning office and capitalists.
838	8	REMOVED
838	9	Probably best together to make policing easier. They should not be in rural areas either as resources are already stretched and with little in the way of facilities, other distractions and temptations take over.
838	10	REMOVED
839	1	No
839	2	Yes, but to the southwest
839	3	41
839	4	none
839	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
840	1	No
840	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
840	3	No, we feel the village has now seen enough housing with the detention centre site.
840	4	None due to the detention centre development.
840	5	Too much traffic within a small rural village
840	6	Kids play area and football field should be protected.
840	7	Existing sites
840	8	Separate
841	1	No, this does not take into account the previous developments in the village.
841	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
841	3	No, the village has seen too much housing growth with the detention centre development. NO TO MORE HOUSING.
841	4	NONE
841	5	The village is covered by a Conservation Area, which is designed to protect the character of the village. Anymore housing would negatively impact on this.
841	6	I agree.
841	7	Existing sites near services.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
842	1	We do not want to have the rug taken from under our feet if Site no. 251 was to be designated for housing. 8 acres is barely enough to operate viably on, so Rhubarb Farm would not even want to see a small part of the land designated for housing, because it would make a big hole in our economic viability. In addition, Rhubarb Farm would like to enter into negotiation with the Welbeck Estate to use the old house on Site Ref. No.252 as a cafe, shop for our produce, and training space for our courses. The small piece of land behind this house would be perfect for growing herbs and as a teaching area for growing. The location of this site on the main road would be perfect to attract passing trade and running a cafe and shop would enable us to do far more in training volunteers in customer service, as well as generate more income to support the enterprise and provide more employment. We have not as yet talked with Welbeck, but feel that our proposed use of this building would be more in keeping with the area, and would preserve and restore an historic house in the village, instead of losing it to a new development. Since Bassetlaw District Council gave Rhubarb Farm planning permission to operate as a social enterprise on the piece of land Ref. No. 251, and both Bassetlaw organisations, and Nottinghamshire organisations and Council have funded Rhubarb Farm, we fervently hope that officers and councillors will see fit not to designate housing on this site or on Site 252 and allow Rhubarb Farm to continue to bring economic and social benefit to the village and the wider area.
842	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
842	3	Yes, we agree with 10 new homes
842	4	252 is the best site
842	5	Main cockney road is busy.
842	6	Yes they all should be protected.
842	7	none in NL please
842	8	as above
842	9	none
843	1	Do not agree. Our Parish Plan published in 2010 should be sufficient information to reject on further development in the village
843	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
843	3	No not really. The Parish Plan reflected no housing was required. The way the housing issues were addressed in both the parish plan and the later planning department questionnaire naturally led to an indication of some housing need and speaking with neighbours and friends there was if anything at all, a need for small privately owned "started homes" which is not the same as "affordable" housing under the planning department glossary. Housing association has generally led to town misfits and trouble families being placed in villages where they don't want to be and are not generally able to integrate. Young village people don't have anywhere in the village to buy anymore and are forced to leave the area. The only buildings that ever seem to happen in the village now are large 5 bed executive homes which are far too expensive.
843	4	There are no sites in the village acceptable for development as this will lead to wholesale abuse and creepage across all redundant land and the last remaining open paddocks and green spaces in the village.
843	5	Every time planning permission is granted it is for 5 bed executive homes for which there is no demonstrable requirement for. Villages are a mixture of small 2 up 2 down cottages through to 8 bed mansions and everything in between. This mix of housing and culture is being destroyed by over development and greed of developers capitalising on big exec homes and ignoring the villages need for small homes for the children to grow in to.
843	6	All open space should be protected.
843	7	Any redundant land should be compulsory purchased from people who have neglected it for over ten years and the villages should then have a greater say in what happens to it i.e. Allotments, orchards, small scale starter homes (not estates), Recreational ground etc.
843	8	Sutton already has the Daneshill site and that's enough thank you.
843	9	No comment just not in or near Sutton, thank you
843	10	None in or near Sutton
844	1	Sutton has a parish plan already that states no more development.
844	2	The term "affordable housing" was misleading. Many people thought this was about starter homes for young people like me, but it wasn't. For those who took the time to read the glossary, they would have found that it basically meant housing association dwellings for use by people that fall outside of scope for the usually housing benefit help. I have friends in other villages where this type of development has happened and they state that you would not want to live there and have these people as neighbours? read into that what you want.
844	3	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
844	4	If it was four small cottages (2 up 2 down) type houses that may be acceptable.
844	5	But there is always going to be an issue of how do you make sure that the villagers are able to get them? Privately owned see's them go on the open market to the highest bidder, and council aren't interested in having housing for ordinary people anymore, they just seem hell bent on helping the misfits and benefit cheats. There used to be a council estate in the village which was where people could have a nice house well built etc. as a first home until they could afford to move (if they wanted to own there own place) but the council have all but sold them all now, so I don't have a chance to get a house in the village when I leave home.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
844	6	Not really sure. Anywhere would just seem to open up the village to the possibility of wide spread development on the larger sites which would ruin the village. Little developments on the road side that blocked off sites from further development may give people more confidence that the planning department weren't just going to sell the village down the river. Planning office should get more involved and proactive with local people and the local council to gain genuine trust and work together to provide for the villages children as they set out on their lives.
844	7	Infill destroys opportunities for people to aspire to "the big house with a bit of land" where they might get involved in original rural activities such as chickens and pigs and things like that and having vegetables. If you keep letting people build on the big gardens etc. this aspect of the community will be gone for ever, and it just ends up like Stepford Wives!
844	8	All open spaces should be protected and used for the community if the owner leaves it redundant. If land is not used and maintained properly then something should be done to get it into community ownership. The village can't apparently afford to provide allotments because all the available land has been bought and left idle by people hoping to sell it off as expensive building plots.
844	9	Concentrate them in the centre of Nottingham city centre.
844	10	Keep them together so it takes less sites overall.
845	1	1) I am concerned that these sites will generate even more traffic on Tiln Lane and Bigsby Road and in particular worsen the already present road safety problems at the Bigsby Road/Tiln Lane junction and the Moorgate/Tiln Lane junction . The Bigsby Road/Tiln Lane junction is misaligned slightly making turning right from Tiln Lane to Bigsby Road and the right turn from Bigsby Road to Tiln Lane considerably less safe than these turns should be. This is often made worse by the speed of traffic travelling from Smeath Lane direction and by HGVs travelling at speed and using the middle of the road to negotiate the bend on Tiln Lane just before Bigsby Road.
845	2	The Tiln Lane/ Moorgate junction is dangerous now without increased traffic. Again the alignment, with a bend on Tiln Lane just before the junction does not help; this is a particular problem when long HGVs are attempting to exit onto Moorgate and they often block the other side of the road often causing traffic wanting to exit Moorgate onto Tiln Lane to stop on Moorgate. Illegally parked cars also often hamper vision and when the sun is low in the sky in early mornings this adds to the safety problem. Everyday there are near misses by responsible drivers here, often the junction layout leads to frustrated drivers who take risks which would be unnecessary if the junction was better designed. Tiln Lane is the diversionary route for tall vehicles round Clarborough bridge; in my observation it is also used by many HGVs travelling to outside the immediate area who are not over height for the bridge, this is presumably because they are unsure of their exact height . Other issues also exist at this junction and I would be pleased to go into more detail if required.
845	3	2) I am concerned by the impact on other local infrastructure. Water pressure is often low in the area, particularly in the summer.
845	4	Broadband speeds are already generally low by modern standards and BT broadband grinds to a complete halt most mornings for several hours.
845	5	Worthy of note also is that there is no current provision for medical services or shops in the immediate local area.
845	6	In addition to the foregoing I am also concerned, as a regular user of the footpath through this site,
845	7	the loss of ecological habitats and landscape
845	8	impact on public visual amenity (particularly from the Chesterfield canal).
846	1	The reasons are; LOCAL ROAD ACCESS TO THESE SITES ARE POOR - there is considerable congestion at school times already on Bracken Lane; any further development would make this worse. One child was recently involved in an accident outside the school, crossing over where there is often double parking at school collection time, and cars weaving in and out of parked cars. Other access to 488, 489 is a very narrow farm track with housing on either side.
846	2	BRACKEN LANE SCHOOL IS OVER-FULL - there would be no places for additional children moving nearby.
846	3	THESE FIELDS NORMALLY FLOOD IN THE WINTER. Developments would suffer as there is a brook running down Bracken Lane, and also across the Lane into the sites identified as 488, 489, where there is a 90 degree turn towards Bracken Lane farm. This brook floods in pools in the fields.
847	1	No
847	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
847	3	No not anymore housing
847	4	none
847	5	Finkell street park should be protected
847	6	Existing
848	1	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic.
848	2	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used.
848	3	Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
848	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road user and school children. HGVs have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
849	1	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic.
849	2	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used.
849	3	Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
849	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road user and school children. HGVs have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
850	1	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic.
850	2	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used.
850	3	Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
850	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road user and school children. HGVs have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
851	1	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic.
851	2	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used.
851	3	Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
851	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road user and school children. HGVs have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
852	1	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic.
852	2	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used.
852	3	Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
852	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road user and school children. HGVs have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
853	1	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic. HGVs have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
853	2	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used.
853	3	Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
853	4	The character of this part of Retford will be changed, for the worse, by the proposed development.
854	1	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic.
854	2	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used.
854	3	Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
854	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road user and school children. HGVs have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
855	1	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic.
855	2	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used.
855	3	Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
855	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road user and school children. HGVs have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
856	1	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic.
856	2	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used.
856	3	Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
856	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road user and school children. HGVs have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.
857	1	The existing highway infrastructure will not be able to cope with the increased traffic.
857	2	Good agricultural land will be lost if these sites are used.
857	3	Brownfield sites should be used before agricultural land is developed.
857	4	There will be additional traffic and safety issues for road user and school children. HGVs have to use this route to avoid the low bridge at Welham. Their numbers are increasing and will add to the present congestion along Tiln Lane at school times.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
858	1	When accessing from either end the development bordering Ashes Park A venue and Edison Park Avenue by motor vehicle, cycle or on foot it gradually opens out revealing a clean, fresh, green, spacious landscape occupied by well maintained houses of many sizes and designs that are accessed via roundabouts and side roads within wild life corridors which include ponds, a stream (visited by Heron, Mallard and Moorhen), shrubs and wooded areas, bridle paths, well maintained grassed areas with random seating and a ball games area with goalposts. The estate also houses an infants/primary school. This is the ambience that residents selected when moving their families into this area. It is used daily by hundreds of walkers, joggers and dog walkers, outside school hours there are always children on bikes or just playing (I think they just hang out as well theses days). Children are often seen in the stream pursuing sticklebacks' and the like whilst others are on their bikes at an area they call the ramps honing the skills they may later use on proper BMX tracks and the like. On a daily basis many from outside the estate take welcome advantage of the surroundings to walk their dogs. Every week a local football team utilise the area to train and Worksop Junior Harriers can be seen doing their extra endurance training. The area is a well used and appreciated green space which should remain a classified Protected Green Space and not a potential green space giving any council the opportunity to hive off all or sections for development. With the probably imminent development of many more houses within the area accessed via Churchill Way it is even more important that this area remains Protected Green Space for the new residents to use as well. This estate complements the adjacent ' Old Gateford Conservation Area' and should continue to do so. These signatures are from the small area of the estate built by Shepherd Homes. If the whole estate bordering this area were canvassed the count would easily exceed 1000!
858	2	'The undersigned residents request that the areas either side of Ashes Park Avenue and Edison Park Avenue within the current developments remain as designated as Protected Open Green Spaces'.
859	1	Site allocation no. 4. We object to the above site being used for housing development. This is the only course locally that doesn't require large membership fees that young people, pensioners and ordinary working class can't afford.
860	1	After receiving your letter we are completely against any building projects on site number (4).
861	1	I would like to put my objections for you to consider. My main concern is the flooding in this area, we have lived here for 10 years and my housed is situated next but one to the fields in question. Every winter the garden is either under water or water logged. We had extensive flooding in 2007 which resulted in flooding all around my property. Entering London road from either Grove Coach Rd or Bracken Lane is already a problem, with all the extra traffic from the above development would cause a road safety issue. Planning for houses in this area was turned down in 1995/6 because of all the above points so why should anything be different in 2012?
861	2	Lastly Bracken Lane School is almost full to capacity and cannot be extended any further and once again during the winter the children cannot go on the playing fields as it is water logged.
862	1	Area 69 is an important green wedge of land and is visually important to users of the canal towpath.
862	2	The land has a wealth of flora and fauna and wildlife, some of which may be endangered species, especially the 'barn owls' and 'water voles'. Building on this land would affect their habitat.
862	3	The land is also low lying and waterlogged, at times we have seen it totally flooded. This would cause drainage problems.
863	1	Poor access to Blackstope Lane from Gas House Bridge, where an accident is waiting to happen with cars parked right up to the corner on the access roads.
863	2	Blackstope Lane is a residential area, where the majority of residents are pensioners who appreciate the lack of constant traffic.
863	3	The end of the lane is a single track, already weakened and damaged by heavy lorries accessing previous works.
863	4	The area is liable to flooding.
863	5	Any development would put a strain on the existing sewerage system.
863	6	Much as we should like to see the old factory demolished and the area tidied up, we feel that any development would be inappropriate.
864	1	strongly disagree that 'Enough land should be allocated in Ranskill for at least 14 new houses'. The question itself is badly stated. This is asking residents to agree to at least 14 new houses which is in effect a blank cheque for any number of new houses above 14, i.e. potentially unlimited. I also strongly disagree with the statement contained in the question 'as suggested in feedback from the residents questionnaire'. I have looked at the data and cannot find a significant number of residents who support more than 10 new houses.
864	2	I would support up to 10 new houses built within the existing village boundary, and using brown field land, or infill between existing properties, permission to be granted through the existing planning arrangements and tested on an individual basis by residents, Parish Council and Bassetlaw Planning Department.
864	3	Data from the recent survey indicates that 64% of residents said no new housing at all, and a further 7.6% said only 0 -10 houses. I think that non respondents should be regarded as not sufficiently interested to consider and complete the questionnaire and by their actions, willing to accept the majority view. This large majority in favour of no new housing is consistent with the previous survey conducted for the Parish Plan in 2006. If the surveys are not to be brought into disrepute (already a widespread view of why bother to reply when 'they' will do what they want anyway), then the views of the residents should be followed, Bassetlaw should support no new building. There have been considerable new housing developments within the village boundary in recent years, i.e. Lowfield Close, Bluebell Court and Willow Avenue, the large Persimon development at the bottom of Station Road which has only recently been completed, and is not yet fully occupied. I believe that this is sufficient for a village of this size, residents live, and have moved into the village, to live in a village environment and it should be kept at this size, and the village boundaries protected against further development. Ranskill has a farming community and farming is conducted all around the village. Some residents earn their living from farming, and it is important that this is sustained for the future and farming land should not be diminished.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
864	4	As a general principle the village envelope should be kept as it is now. There is continual pressure by landowners to convert their gardens or fields into building land beyond the boundaries for obvious financial gain. This should not be done beyond existing boundaries to the detriment of the village as a whole. Building should not be allowed to compromise the envelope and create precedents that developers can exploit.
864	5	The village has a main road passing through it North to South. West to East Blyth Road, Station Road and Mattersey Road are subject to heavy traffic and accidents occur at the crossroads, despite the installation of traffic lights.
864	6	The main East coast Railway line passes close to the east of the village and creates noise. The recent development of Robin Hood Airport has created noise increases in the area. Mining has caused subsidence problems for residents.
864	7	There is an open aspect to the west of North Road, this should be retained.
864	8	The settlements of Torworth, Ranskill, Scrooby Top and Scrooby are all areas with their own individual identities, separated by their boundaries and mainly farm land. New housing developments tend to follow the line of main roads. It is essential that these settlements retain their own identities and there should be no development to the Northern and Southern boundaries, to prevent creep towards integration of these settlements. Developing any part of the Site 234 will create a precedent and inevitably the land to the North of the site would be developed.
864	9	This site is bordered on two sides by Folly Nook. This lane is a major asset to the village and is a well loved example of a country lane with a rural aspect and fields on either side. It is used by many villagers as a safe, short recreational walk and has been developed as such by the provision of two seats (one of which was donated by a villager in memory of walks with his wife), trees and a waste bin at the junction with North Road. As the village is crossed by fast major roads there are few walks for residents away from the main road.
864	10	This site is bordered and bisected by hedgerows which give a country aspect and are home for diverse wildlife at a time when many hedgerows are being threatened. They should be retained and development excluded from this site.
864	11	At the Consultation Meeting the Bassetlaw team seemed to favour developing a strip of currently farmed land at the edge of a field between existing housing and an isolated, long established bungalow along Folly Nook Lane. I would strongly object to this as it would go beyond the village boundary, spoil the previously mentioned open aspect and be used as a precedent to develop the site further.
864	12	There are environmental concerns of a potentially large increase in the number of vehicles accessing Folly Nook Lane and North Road, where there is already a major problem for vehicles entering and leaving Arundel Drive.
864	13	This site is beyond the Village envelope and if developed would be used as a precedent for development of the other Northern sites, such as 234 and 224. Planning permission has been applied for and rejected on two previous occasions, including rejection following an Appeal. It compromises Folly Nook Lane for the reasons detailed under Site 234.
864	14	Development in this site behind the existing properties will adversely affect the quality of life of the residents of Folly Nook Lane. It will go against the country aspect of the lane.
864	15	This site is one property with planning permission for one further property. This site has been affected by the confusing movement of Bassetlaw DC reducing the boundary of the village envelope, to put the site outside the previously existing boundary.
864	16	Any building outside the existing boundaries would provide precedence for further development beyond boundaries, and weakens the Village envelope.
864	17	Does not compromise any village amenities such as open aspects and country walks.
864	18	Does not have any issues relating to heritage properties.
864	19	No traffic implications as in site 234.
864	20	The nature of the site would lead to potentially large number of properties making the village much bigger. Does not have any implications for joining the separate communities.
864	21	This site is outside the boundary and would set a precedent if used.
864	22	The general area around site 537 is poorly served with roads and is generally in a poor state. The land does not seem to have a particular agricultural use.
864	23	Current access is from Station Road, any further development would add to existing heavy traffic issues along this road. The new development just to the west of the railway line has added to the traffic problems.
864	24	If development outside the boundary had to occur, I would support a small development of site 537. However, it would be necessary to upgrade the road system, possibly by opening Access Road along to Mattersey Road, to reduce existing traffic problems along Station Road.
864	25	This site does not compromise the individuality of the settlements.
864	26	This is a large site with a capacity of 191 houses. I strongly object to this site being used for new housing for many of the reasons previously given.
864	27	At present the open aspect of the village including this site is an asset to the village and residents of North Road.
864	28	It is again outside the village boundaries and building would breach the envelope and create precedents.
864	29	It has got to be assumed that if part of this site were developed, the landowner would push for the rest of the site to be developed in due course.
864	30	A large number of vehicles entering and exiting North Road would increase traffic problems.
864	31	It is currently valuable farming land and should be kept as such.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
864	32	A site that was previously identified for new housing was the land on North Road, between the new development of Blue Bell Court and the Police House. This site is not now included in the plan. It is known locally as Choppins Field and is owned by an absentee landlord whose family originally came from, and some of whom still live in, the village. It is overgrown and an eye sore. Vegetation is allowed to overgrow the path and the owners have to be chased up to maintain it. It is outside the boundary, and whilst I am against any developments outside the boundary, it is a limited site and would support the small number of houses that are proposed.
864	33	However, development here would certainly affect the open aspect and be to the detriment of residents nearby.
864	34	The overriding issue is the credibility and continuation of the Village boundary. The Boundary has recently been tightened by Bassetlaw DC and now these proposals confirmed by their Consultation Team would require a further redrawing of the boundary to include the new site. It is clear that the majority of the village do not support this and wish for minimal new housing. This can be dealt with by individual applications within the existing boundary. Developers will exploit any inconsistencies or flaws in the proposals because it has been done before and is in their interests to continue to do so.
864	35	I would support protection of the open spaces identified on the maps.
864	36	However, the village playing field already has existing planning permission for the erection of a Village Hall, which the village currently lacks, and any protection should still allow for this to be built on the site for the benefit of the village as a whole.
865	1	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already supporting heavy traffic levels; an increase in housing will put additional pressure on the roundabout and stretch of road exiting at Gateford Road, making the current situation more dangerous and adding to pollution and noise levels.
865	2	The proposed area is currently productive agricultural land.
865	3	The environment would suffer badly - the area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, local sites of importance for nature conservation. There would be a loss of ecological habitat, including trees and hedgerows, affecting local wildlife.
865	4	The public bridleway which enters from Montford Road and stretches to Owday Plantation is used and enjoyed daily by both habitants of the estate and many others visiting for recreational purposes.
865	5	Local schools (nursery, primary and secondary) are already filled to capacity.
865	6	The road around the Celtic Park shopping site is often gridlocked, particularly since the opening of the Asda store, and there have been a number of accidents involving cars entering and exiting the shopping precinct.
865	7	The majority of residents will have chosen to live here due to the nature of the surrounding area, I believe most of us will feel that the area has now absorbed housing to full capacity, and any additional housing would have a detrimental effect on the area.
865	8	The local Bassetlaw Hospital and surrounding GP surgeries would have to absorb such a major increase in population, has any serious thought been given to this by the planners?
866	1	I object to this proposal, as I used to live at number 55 Grove Coach Road for over 20 years, during this time we were flooded 3 (three) times, as you will see from the photographs enclosed. These were taken in the early part of the month of June, Spring Bank Holiday time as my children were off school, I am not sure of the year but it was between 1980-1985. The dyke which runs at the side of the house and garden over flowed. As you see from the photos the water flooded the back garden and carport, it also covered the front garden and the front door had to be sandbagged. I had sewerage coming up my down stairs toilet and the fire place in the lounge.
866	2	The land around this area is known for flooding and further housing would cause problems with traffic of about 500 cars trying to get out of Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane on to London Road which is a nightmare already.
866	3	I am sure Bracken Lane School cannot cope with more children.
866	4	We have plenty of properties for sale in and around this area of Retford without another 600 houses.
867	1	Yes.
867	2	Spread equally between Harworth Bircotes, Retford and Worksop, subject to consultation with those communities.
867	3	No. We cannot imagine that, in responding to that question, residents meant other than the total number of houses they were happy to see built. It is not credible that they would have excluded from the average total of 13 the Corner Farm and other developments now in progress that had not commenced at the time, or the proposed five affordable dwellings. We held an extraordinary meeting to consider the Site Allocations questionnaire, and members of the public present confirmed this opinion. The questionnaire asked residents how many new houses they would like to see built – not how many new approvals there should be in addition to the current 17 approvals. The Parish Council considered that the wording of this question may cause confusion to members of the public not versed in planning. There was felt to be a danger in the Planning Department accepting comments from the public at face value. In view of the number of approvals, plus the proposed five affordable dwellings, we do not believe there is a need to allocate any sites for further dwellings. It is also a fact that there will continue to be windfall development within the settlement over the next 15 years.
867	4	Our Parish Plan, which was the subject of detailed consultation, with a response rate of over 70% of households, states: The main conservation issue is achieving adequate control over future housing development, particularly in view of the amount of extension and infill building, to preserve the character of the Parish and meet the view of residents that future development should be strictly limited, but include some affordable housing. Government policy may well move in favour of increased green field development and we cannot rule out that, despite residents' wishes for strictly limited development, this may affect Everton. It is important, therefore, that we liaise with Bassetlaw District Council over Planning Guidelines, making the Council aware of the concern of residents and taking a view on the nature and location of significant development if this becomes inevitable.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
867	5	No. Please see explanation at Question 66.
867	6	We do not see the need for development of any of the potential development sites shown on the map during the next 15 years.
867	7	We should further stress that, if development of any of these sites does become a consideration, we would definitely wish to see those within the conservation area excluded
867	8	Every effort made to avoid development on agricultural land.
867	9	We have previously pointed out that sites 477 and 484 are prone to flooding. Bassetlaw District Council intended to implement a drainage scheme in order to resolve this problem, but funding was not available at the time.
867	10	Reasons for designating Protected Open Spaces: Helps to maintain a build environment appropriate to a village, by preventing development reaching an urban or suburban density and appearance. Provides habitat and corridors for wildlife. As they are often wooded, or grassed, they contribute to improving air quality, and absorb noise.
867	11	Specific to Sites 296 and 453: Situated at the core of the village of Everton (main crossroads, public house, farmhouses, etc.). Bounded by a Roman road. Borders the site of a significant landmark/building (Methodist Chapel, now unused). Will interrupt what could otherwise become a solid block of housing. Within the Historic Village Core.
867	12	Specific to Site 401(Southern part, between Northfield Farmstead and Windy Ridge): The relatively high density of North field Farmstead needs an adjacent open space to compensate. The land is currently used for pasture and hay. Boasts a mature (possibly walnut) tree, probably worthy of a tree preservation order.
867	13	Other comments on Protected Open Spaces: Most are public, or for community use, such as playing fields, recreation grounds, playgrounds, churches, cemeteries, schools, etc. Many villages (such as Gringley on the Hill and Gamston) also have Protected Open Spaces that are private and fenced-off Gringley has a Public Open Space which is a large field bounded by Little Lane and Horse Wells Street, currently in use as a paddock (3-4 ponies/donkeys), fenced and gates locked; which also appears to extend to some back gardens. OS maps show a north-south footpath through it, but it is not signposted. Gamston has a Protected Open Space which extends around most of Gamston Manor, behind fences and electric gates -very private.
867	14	We request that consideration is given to the already unsatisfactory and unsafe parking situation in Everton and the impact of this on access, particularly on Chapel Lane and High Street (that at times are virtually one-way streets due to parked vehicles), when deciding on future housing growth.
867	15	We stress that planning gain should be a fundamental consideration in future planning permissions.
868	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
868	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
868	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
868	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
868	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
868	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
868	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
868	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
869	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
869	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
869	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
869	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
869	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
869	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
869	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
869	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
870	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
870	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
870	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
870	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
870	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
870	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
870	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
870	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
871	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
871	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
871	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
871	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
871	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
871	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
871	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
871	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
872	1	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35. This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.
872	2	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
872	3	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
872	4	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
872	5	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
872	6	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
872	7	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
872	8	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
872	9	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
873	1	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35. This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.
873	2	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
873	3	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
873	4	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
873	5	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
873	6	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
873	7	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
873	8	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
873	9	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
874	1	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35. This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.
874	2	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
874	3	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
874	4	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
874	5	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
874	6	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
874	7	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
874	8	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
874	9	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
875	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
875	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
875	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
875	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area.
875	5	In addition, Increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
875	6	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
875	7	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
875	8	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical.
875	9	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
876	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
876	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
876	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
876	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area.
876	5	In addition, Increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
876	6	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
876	7	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
876	8	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical.
876	9	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
877	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
877	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
877	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
877	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area.
877	5	In addition, Increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
877	6	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
877	7	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
877	8	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
877	9	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
878	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
878	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
878	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
878	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area.
878	5	In addition, Increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
878	6	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
878	7	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
878	8	E) Access to main routes. With the present Gateford Estate the access to main routes at peak times is gridlocked and the present junctions onto the very busy A57 are very dangerous resulting in many accidents which could result in loss of a life. With the development of site 35 using the present traffic routes it will be impossible for the present residents to use the amenities when required and feet to work without excessive delays which cannot be good for the environment. residents on Cromwell Close and Alexander Drive already suffer with gridlock due to inconsiderate parents using vehicles on school runs which will obviously increase with development of site 35.
878	9	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
878	10	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
878	11	Having living in Worksop all my life and on the Gateford estate for the past 12 years I cannot understand why site 35 is required. Many houses on both sides of Gateford are either empty up for sale or to let and all around Worksop this is the case. Why do we need further development when these properties are available.
879	1	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35 (near Gateford Hill Nursing Home). This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.
879	2	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
879	3	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
879	4	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
879	5	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
879	6	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
879	7	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
879	8	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
879	9	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
880	1	No. Grade 3 agricultural land should be in the R category, as suggested by PPS7.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
880	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
880	3	No. Existing approvals (19) more than cover the 13 new dwellings suggested.
880	4	No.
880	5	None
880	6	Sites in Everton, North of A631 suffer from: -Traffic generation
880	7	access
880	8	road safety
880	9	parking provision(access has to be via High St or Chapel Lane, both very narrow)
880	10	Impact on listed buildings and/or Conservation Areas
880	11	Yes and added to where appropriate
881	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
881	2	No. You have blatantly manipulated the data to meet your own purposes. The majority of villages who responded to the Village Plan, and those that responded to your questionnaire did not want to see any development in the village.
881	3	Once again your not listening! We have said by a majority we don't want further development.
881	4	Your use of statistical data need reporting to the Ombudsman....its being manipulated to suit the response you are under pressure to achieve.
881	5	Yes
881	6	We don't want any, so if required add to existing sites.
882	1	What does this mean?
882	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
882	3	I strongly disagree. The utilities cannot support the number of houses currently approved for planning.
882	4	None
882	5	The village has implemented a parish plan that states no further housing development. However if affordable housing was an option, how would these people survive rurally with limited public transport and resources in the village?
882	6	Yes
882	7	Traveller site at Daneshill is currently closed - why not open this rather than opting for new development
882	8	Together. There i a facility already providing this at Daneshill
882	9	Daneshill
883	1	Option A
883	2	No, i believe that enough housing has been built in the village. The village cannot cope with anymore housing as we have no shop or post office.
883	3	No sites are preferred.
883	4	Traffic and drainage is an issue to the East of the village.
883	5	Yes, the sports ground should be protected.
884	1	Yes
884	2	Option A.
884	3	Not unless the flooding and A57 are sorted out. The village has nearly flooded in 2000, 2005, 2007 and 2009.
884	4	Further housing would also cause problems for the A57, which currently a difficult access.
884	5	The Green should be retained.
884	6	Existing sites
884	7	Separate
885	1	Yes, I agree
885	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
885	3	Yes, for an 18 year period, I believe that 18 new houses would not impact the village too much.
885	4	480 would need to be redeveloped first - I agree that a mixed use is best for this site.
885	5	I feel the housing should be placed toward the village and the employment to the edge, so the impact is less on local residents.
885	6	All open spaces need protecting from development
885	7	Existing sites in Worksop
886	1	No

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
886	2	Option A
886	3	No, due to the detention centre development, i would not support anymore housing growth plans for Gringley.
886	4	None are attractive
886	5	Overcapacity of new housing
886	6	Yes, I agree
887	1	I think site 35 is unsuitable due to the large housing estate already in place which leads to traffic congestion in mornings and evenings. It can take us 10 minutes to get out of the estate in a morning at the moment. The recent traffic survey was run far too late in the morning, whilst we were queuing at 7.50am they were still setting up and having a cup of tea. A further amount of 700 houses could lead to up to 1400 cars (the average household has 2 cars.
887	2	We have 2 primary schools which are already full - is another planned?
887	3	There is nothing for children to do to keep them occupied leading to gangs meeting up and causing disruption and vandalism. We already have congestion on the A57 going to Sheffield will the road system be improved?
887	4	The 50/50 housing leads to crime, we currently have Stillwell Gardens and the majority of the crime in our area is from the families living in these houses. The police have confirmed this as we have had to call them out several times for crime and property vandalism!
887	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
888	1	I think that site 35 is unsuitable for building houses on. The gatefold estate is already very large and access to the estate via either gatefold road or Carlton road is at peak times very dangerous to pedestrians and car users
888	2	and can take an excessive amount of time to get off the estate. Just this morning at 8am, the queue of traffic trying to get of the estate onto gatefold road was tailing back beyond the first roundabout on the estate.
888	3	I have a two year old child who I would like to attends Gateford Park Primary School - this school is already overly subscribed, how will the school be able to cope with even more houses and children in it's catchment area?
888	4	One of the things that makes Gateford such a lovely place to live, is the safe green space, which is ideal for dog walking, children playing, football games, etc. This promotes a real community environment which will be destroyed.
888	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
889	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
889	2	1. Spoiling current greenbelt land which is currently utilised for nature, farming and walkers.
889	3	2. Local schools already at capacity - more housing would lead to more families and therefore increased pressure on all local schools and nursery's which are already pushed.
889	4	3. Invasion of privacy on houses which overlook this land. Home owners paid a premium for the view and space and building further houses will remove this and devalue properties.
889	5	4. Property market already stagnant - how would houses sell.
889	6	5. Current lack of family provisions / facilities e.g. playgrounds - more houses more families - nothing to occupy them with.
889	7	6. Local facilities / shops already dangerous at peak times - more volume / traffic will make this worse.
889	8	7. Ashes park avenue / Gateford Road Junction - very busy at peak times - can take up to 25mins to exit housing estate - more houses, more cars will worsen situation.
889	9	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
890	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable
890	2	1. Spoiling current greenbelt land which is currently utilised for nature, farming and walkers.
890	3	2. Local schools already at capacity - more housing would lead to more families and therefore increased pressure on all local schools and nursery's which are already pushed.
890	4	3. Invasion of privacy on houses which overlook this land. Home owners paid a premium for the view and space and building further houses will remove this and devalue properties.
890	5	4. Property market already stagnant - how would houses sell.
890	6	5. Current lack of family provisions / facilities e.g. playgrounds - more houses more families - nothing to occupy them with.
890	7	6. Local facilities / shops already dangerous at peak times - more volume / traffic will make this worse.
890	8	7. Ashes park avenue / Gateford Road Junction - very busy at peak times - can take up to 25mins to exit housing estate - more houses, more cars will worsen situation.
890	9	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
891	1	Not entirely - areas such as location 35 should not be a consideration for building.
891	2	No - more housing does not necessarily mean that residents will use the town - many people live here but work away. I personally use the town centre but we are retired and we visit the town quite often we also walk around the area.
891	3	I think location 35 is not suitable. This is a beautiful area and many people visitors and residents alike enjoy the amenity that this area provides.
891	4	Taking into account that location 28 & W6 (Gateford Common) is also earmarked for 381 houses and 195, 343 & W8 earmarked for a total of 611 houses it appears that you are gradually encroaching on this beautiful landscape.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
891	5	By partially developing the brown sites which are earmarked surely there is no need to destroy areas such as location 35
891	6	I am not totally familiar with the area neither am I a planning officer but surely the brown sites you have earmarked are sufficient.
891	7	Location 35 is an important open space used by many people having an ancient bridleway running through it.
891	8	I think all open spaces should be protected so that we can breathe some pure air instead of the carbon monoxide fumes which all this new housing will bring in bucket loads.
891	9	Extra litter would be created which emanates from the Celtic Point shopping centre up to about half a mile either way - which appears to be an uphill struggle for Bassetlaw Council to keep on top of
891	10	Speeding in the area
891	11	Youths gathering in cars in various parts -Celtic Point Centre, Old Gateford Road etc.
891	12	I agree that some building has to be done and that employment opportunities must be provided but I will say once again that I am not familiar enough with the whole area to make rash statements as to what I consider is right.
891	13	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
891	14	REMOVED
891	15	REMOVED
891	16	No - not sufficiently familiar with the whole area. We have only lived here for 15 months.
891	17	700 new dwellings could equate to up to 1400 extra vehicles using the same road infrastructure on a daily basis thus creating more congestion, noise, pollution and also the danger to pedestrians and cyclists. Ashes Park is already used as a 'race track' and indeed few drivers, of any age, abide by the rules of the road when driving around the estate (i.e. cutting corners at junctions is the most frightening -we never approach a junction without extreme caution).
891	18	Litter and dog fouling is also a problem that is not going to go away. The number of dog owners will increase -we often see owners with up to two, three and <i>even</i> more dogs and the <i>evidence</i> is all around on verges, greens and pavements. Litter is horrendous, most of it is from the Celtic Point Shopping Centre with litter in both directions. If these issues can't be controlled now with up to 700 more dwellings this beautiful area will become a nightmare estate of colossal proportions .
891	19	The loss of amenity that the proposed building will cause to residents and visitors alike (living as we do with our back garden onto Montford Road we see walkers, cyclists and horse riders regularly using the bridleway) would be a travesty. This is still a beautiful area but enough is enough and we can do no more than plead for sanity when it comes to destroying historical Gateford altogether.
891	20	The strain extra housing will place on local infrastructure and resources such as schools, doctors, dentists and other healthcare services will be intolerable. The local shopping centre is already heavily congested and the traffic queues at the top of Ashes Park at peak times will only worsen
892	1	I think that the entire site at location 35 should be protected and not developed. Further development in this location will result in: (i) An unacceptable level of housing density that is too high
892	2	(ii) Significant increase in traffic generation leading to
892	3	(iii) Increase in road safety issues
892	4	(iv) Inadequate parking provision
892	5	(v) Loss of trees and hedgerows
892	6	(v1) Loss of ecological habitats and landscapes
892	7	(vii) Inadequate infrastructure such a local transport, hospitals, doctors surgeries, schools etc. to support the extremely large proposed development.
892	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
893	1	No, because we feel at the moment there is enough allocated housing without adding to it.
893	2	In the future we would prefer to see housing sited on area 9, 4 & W9.
893	3	Area 9 would be better for ease of access to the M1 motorway Link.
893	4	Area 4 & W9 would be better giving ease of access by foot to the town centre, Hospital and Doctors surgery and access to the A1 link.
893	5	None at the moment until all the new properties that have been erected on claylands and shireoaks triangle have companies renting them and bringing extra employment. Then in the future it should be considered!!
893	6	We feel that Areas 4 & W9 would fill this potential for a mixed use site or just housing.
893	7	We feel that Area 35 should be left as open space as to much valuable farm land would be taken over and also primarily losing the woods that back onto Owday Lane would be potentially hazardous as far as conservation is concerned.
893	8	The massive development plan for area 35 will cause significant increase of traffic exiting & entering the Gateford estate, increased danger to pedestrians.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
893	9	Strain on schools & services, worse traffic at local shops as well as increased pollution.
893	10	Option A: Spread between Worksoy; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
893	11	We feel that any gypsy and traveller sites should be concentrated in and around existing sites because they should be allowed to have there own communities on going.
893	12	We feel that they both should be located together to provide better standard of permanent services.
893	13	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksoy will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
893	14	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
893	15	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
893	16	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area.
893	17	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
893	18	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
893	19	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksoy you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
893	20	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
894	1	The location 35 is totally unsuitable for obvious reasons Inc. strain on schools
894	2	services Inc. hospital facilities
894	3	traffic and safety issues
894	4	increased pollution
894	5	Destruction of farming land
894	6	detrimental effects on local woods and local recreational sites
895	1	Site 540 - 1. This development would necessitate access via a narrow unadopted road without any footpath and no space for one to be created. Being a T road there would be no other form of exit or entry.
895	2	2. The access onto the main road at the bottom of Welfitt is very close to a corner where the speed of the majority of traffic have no regard for the residents pulling out of the grove. Additional traffic would put an extra load onto this already hazardous spot.
895	3	3. Many very mature trees are sited in this area affording access to a vast and varied population of wildlife who could loose their habitat.
895	4	4. This site is also adjacent to a conservation area. Development could interfere with the rules already established.
895	5	5. Deeds to the existing properties along this grove state that there is to be no residential accommodation to the individual plots on the land to the north of the road.
896	1	I feel the local infrastructure would struggle to support the building of allot of houses.
896	2	To consider building 'affordable housing' in Walkeringham to attract couples and their families, allot more thought would have to given to the local school situation. Walkeringham school has just undergone a small extension, but is still full and oversubscribed. I am told by other Mums at school that Beckingham and Gringley are in a similar position, which would leave a journey to Misterton [if places are available there, I don't know about that school] With a lack of reliable buses in the village this would be problematic unless the families being catered for had a car!
896	3	On Station road the sewerage system can be temperamental at the best of times, and would need major work doing if more homes were connected. Similar concerns are raised regarding the low water pressure.
896	4	I agree we need to maintain as many open spaces as possible, but there are one 2 areas marked on the map, which I feel are not enough.
896	5	The 2 areas are the school playing area and the playing field which is used by allot of the community, Village fete, bonfire, school sports day to name a few, plus 2 healthy football teams with supporters most Sundays
896	6	The play equipment is also well used by younger children, accompanied by Mums
896	7	I think looking at the areas on the map, possibly 368 or 293 would be better for access to the existing roads, and would not overlook allot of other houses, or encroach into the other green areas.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
896	8	There seems to be allot of house of all sizes for sale in the village, some for over a year since I moved here, which does make me wonder who cold afford to buy the new ones, if and when they are built?
897	1	2.1. We recognise that Policy CS8 of the adopted Core Strategy establishes that the 20 identified Rural Service Centres (including Everton) could share <i>up to</i> 10% of the District’s total housing requirement 2010 to 2028. This equates to 770 dwellings over the plan period, but allowing for current planning commitments and readily deliverable sites, the residual requirement is 328 dwellings. 2.2. We understand that the intention is that if less than 10% of the housing requirement is ultimately met in the Rural Service Centres, then the residual requirement to meet the District’s total needs will be reapportioned to the larger settlements of Worksop, Retford or Harworth-Bircotes. 2.3. While we accept that the above flexible approach is supported by recently adopted policy embodied in the Core Strategy, we consider that the Site Allocations process should so far as is possible seek to meet the targets for the proportional split of residential development set out in Table 4.1 of the adopted Core Strategy. Any significant variation from such a split will not ensure a sustainable settlement hierarchy. The need to maintain the sustainability of rural settlements, by the appropriate allocation of development in such locations is considered to be particularly important and is in accordance with national policy contained with PPS3: Housing (paragraph 28). 2.4. In accordance with PPS3, the identification of locations for development should be based on the analysis of a range of material planning considerations, which amongst others include: demand and need; the potential contribution to cutting carbon emissions (focussing development in locations with good public transport); constraints and risks associated with broad locations and specific sites; and accessibility to existing community facilities. Such an objective approach should apply to development in both urban and rural locations. 2.5. Thus, the level of development in each of the Rural Service Centres, and the choice of specific sites, should depend on a range of criteria relating to sustainability and suitability. In determining the capacity of each settlement to take further development, we consider that in addition to the availability of local services, particular consideration should also be given to relative proximity and connectivity to higher-order centres which provide more major services. Everton is a highly sustainable location for development, being located on a regular main bus route between the towns of Bawtry and Retford. It is in fact less than 5km from the former settlement. 2.6. It is considered that while the planning authority proposes a logical and objective approach to screening potential sites in the preparation of the subsequent Preferred Options document, to date it has not taken an objective approach to identifying the amount of development that may be suitable in each of the Rural Service Centres.
897	2	2.7. It is understood that a resident’s survey was undertaken in each Rural Service Centre which asked for views on the level of housing development that should be provided for. This has not proved to be an objective way of measuring actual demand or need. In the case of Everton, out of 318 questionnaires, only 89 responses were received – giving a response rate of 27.99%. It is considered that such a low response cannot be considered as statistically significant. 2.8. Although the planning authority has acknowledged that the mean level of residential development considered appropriate by survey respondents was 12.7 houses, we do not consider that such a figure should be regarded as being of particular significance for land-use planning as it is purely a statistical average derived from the responses received. It is not grounded in material planning considerations relating to the sustainability of the settlement as a whole, or the availability of suitable sites. Nor is it based on a representative sample of residents’ views. 2.9. We also note that the survey-driven approach to the apportionment of development is also problematic in that when the survey results for the 20 Rural Service Centres are considered as a whole, there is a shortfall of 3% relative to the identified Core Strategy target for residential development in the Rural Service Centres. The suggestion that this requirement may be redistributed to the three largest settlements, as stated in the Site Allocations Issues and Options document, may not only result in environmental degradation in the affected larger settlements (Worksop, Retford and Harworth / Bircotes), but it could also contribute to the social and economic decline of the affected Rural Service Centres.
897	3	2.10. It should also be noted that the draft National Planning Policy Framework advocates that local authorities should allocate at least a further 20% over the strategic target in order to promote choice: “To boost the supply of housing, local planning authorities should: identify and maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements. The supply should include an additional allowance of at least 20 per cent to ensure choice and competition in the market for land.” (para 109)
897	4	2.11. We would suggest that the determination of how much development may be appropriate must be based on material planning considerations and should be strongly influenced by the potential of available suitable sites. While the overriding aim should be to achieve 10% of all residential development in the 20 Rural Service Centres as a whole, we consider that some individual settlements with particularly strong sustainability credentials (like Everton), and highly suitable sites may in principle take more than an equal share of the residual requirement i.e. more than one twentieth of the residual requirement of 328 dwellings (16.4 dwellings).
897	5	2.12. While the proposed “Stage Two” site assessment criteria appropriately include the question of compatibility with neighbouring land uses, and impact on built character, we consider that in the interests of sound spatial planning, they should be broadened also to refer explicitly to relationship to settlement form and urban design considerations. In that respect, we consider that in estimating the potential development capacity of individual settlements, due regard should be had for sites which sit within or immediately adjacent to the existing settlement envelopes, and particularly those that have the potential to improve the existing built form of the settlement. Such is the case with the subject site at Hall Farm Yard, Gainsborough Road, Everton

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
897	6	<p>3.1. As a Rural Service Centre, Everton is a particularly sustainable location for new development. It is a thriving historic village which includes a number of services. Currently they include a primary school, two pubs, a hairdressing salon, a picture-framing and gift shop, village hall, church and recreation ground. The proposed development would help to sustain the vitality of these local facilities and would encourage the provision of further facilities, so being of benefit to new and existing residents. In addition, the site is less than 5km east of the town of Bawtry, a thriving market town, which provides a broader range of retail and other facilities. Everton is also conveniently located on the A631, along which regular buses travel between Bawtry and Retford (approximately twice hourly), and also Worksop and Gainsborough (twice daily). 3.2. Although access to local services is of significant importance in reducing the potential need to travel, Government guidance emphasises the importance of accessibility to public transport in determining locational sustainability. No individual village can be entirely self-sustaining, as most residents will need to travel to higher order centres to access certain essential services and for employment. Accessibility to public transport should therefore be a key factor in determining the growth potential of individual settlements. 3.3. Planning Policy Statement 1 "Delivering Sustainable Development" was published in 2005. This notes in paragraph 27 that in preparing development plans, planning authorities should take into account issues such as accessibility and sustainable transport needs when bringing forward land for development and should provide improved access for all to jobs, health, education, shops, leisure and community facilities, open space, sport and recreation, by ensuring that new development is located where everyone can access services or facilities on foot, bicycle or public transport rather than having to rely on access by car. Planning should actively manage patterns of urban growth to make the fullest use of public transport. 3.4. Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 "Transport" was published in 2001 and represents current government policy on the relationship between development and transport. Paragraph 3 notes that by shaping the pattern of development and influencing the location, scale, density, design and mix of land uses, planning can help to reduce the need to travel, reduce the length of journeys and make it safer and easier for people to access jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking, and cycling. It therefore states, in paragraph 19 that, in preparing their development plans, local authorities "should give particular emphasis to accessibility in identifying the preferred areas and sites where such land uses should be located". 3.5. National planning policies are therefore calling upon local planning authorities to ensure that new development is accessible by public transport. This approach must therefore be carried forward into all parts of the Local Development Framework including the choice of locations and specific sites for development. If it is not, then the justification for related policy choices is unclear and the plan is unsound. 3.6. We consider that the availability of a range of local services in Everton which may be accessed on foot, together with the village's close proximity to the town of Bawtry (less than 5km), and the availability of good public transport connections to a range of higher order centres potentially justifies the apportionment of more than the 13 dwellings suggested in Table 10.2 of the Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation Document.</p>
897	7	<p>4.1. The site identified at Appendix A, measures approximately 0.52 ha. It constitutes a farmyard which is no longer required for agricultural purposes. The site contains two modern utilitarian agricultural storage buildings which are of poor aesthetic quality and impact adverse on the setting of nearby historic buildings, the Conservation Area and the general appearance of this part of the village. 4.2. The site benefits from an existing vehicular access, currently serving its unregulated use for the storage and distribution of agricultural materials and machinery. The established use has the potential to generate significantly more vehicular traffic of an obstructive nature than the proposed development. It should be noted that the site can also be served by an alternative means of access also within the control of the site owners - that being the driveway from Gainsborough Road further to the west, which currently serves the existing adjacent residential barn conversions. Consultation with Nottinghamshire Highways Authority has to date suggested that the utilisation of both access points may be the most suitable way of serving the site. 4.3. The site stands immediately next to a number of existing residential properties comprising Hall Farm Cottage, the Stables, and dwellings within the barn conversion referred to above. The planning authority has to date considered the adjacent former agricultural barn and stables buildings as curtilage-listed buildings by virtue of their historic association with the Grade II Listed Hall Farmhouse on the north side of Gainsborough Road. A sensitively designed redevelopment of the site would therefore significantly enhance the setting of those heritage assets. 4.4. The development would also significantly improve the general appearance of this part of the village, which is immediately adjacent to a key approach from the east. 4.5. The southern and western boundaries of the site, and the rear portion of the eastern boundary, are well defined by existing gappy hedging, which would be supplemented or replaced as part of any redevelopment.</p>
897	8	<p>4.6. It is envisaged that the site could be viably developed for five dwellings of varying scales, utilising built forms reminiscent of traditional barns, a farmhouse and cottage, which would help to meet the diversity of housing demand in rural parts of Bassetlaw. Such a development would be relatively low density, but this would be fully compatible with the existing pattern of development in this part of Everton, which is now a designated Conservation Area. 4.7. There is sufficient space within the site to facilitate the provision of driveways and garages for each proposed dwelling, so avoiding the need for on-street parking, improving the appearance of the area and discouraging criminal activity. 4.8. We have previously had a number of detailed discussions with the Conservation Officers which culminated in our formulation of a draft development concept. The feedback received was of a very positive nature, and it was verbally agreed that such a development would enhance the setting of nearby listed buildings.</p>

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
897	9	4.9. The sustainability credentials of the site are enhanced by the fact that it lies within 5 minutes walk of the bus route that passes through Everton. 4.10. The site does not suffer from any physical constraints. It lies outside any designated flood zone and is free-draining. It lies at above 10m AOD, and rises marginally to the rear (southern) boundary. The site's established use is unlikely to have caused any land contamination. 4.11. Since June 2010, the site has been included within Everton Conservation Area. It is recognised that Hall Farm on the north side of Gainsborough Road, with which the farmyard was originally associated, is a Grade II listed building, and the converted barns have to date been regarded as being curtilage-listed for their group value. While the proposed redevelopment would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and improve the setting of the above heritage assets which fall within it, the site is not in a position where its development would have any direct effect on the visible setting of Hall Farm itself. 4.12. It is considered that access to the site for the modest development envisaged could be achieved without any significant impact on the highway network. Both of two vehicular accesses may be used. 4.13. While one current function of the site is as a means of through access for agricultural vehicles to the fields beyond, it should be noted that this land may be alternatively accessed from Mill Lane to the south. The proposed development would therefore have no adverse effect on the accessibility and workability of the adjacent agricultural land.
897	10	4.14. A key advantage of the subject site is that while it is not currently defined as being within the development boundary, it is contained to the north and east by existing residential development. Redevelopment of the subject site for residential use would thus be more compliant with existing adjacent uses, and would improve amenity for existing residents. 4.15. Due to the site's well contained nature, it can reasonably be regarded as an opportunity for rounding of the existing area of residential development. Development of the site for housing would therefore not intrude into the surrounding countryside. Rather, it would consolidate the existing form of the settlement. 4.16. We would further comment, that while we are seeking the specific allocation of the site for residential development, the site should as a matter of principle be located within the identified settlement boundary because it falls within an area that has been identified as part of the historically established settlement (ref: Everton Conservation Area – Information for Property Owners, June 2010).
897	11	345 & 400 Relatively distant from village core – less likely to encourage walking to access services.
897	12	453 Small site with poor access (visibility limitations)
897	13	296 Historic open space within village core. Nearby heritage constraints.
897	14	407 Affects setting of adjacent Listed Building, but well located relative to village core – logical ‘infill plot’.
897	15	406 Large visibly prominent gap site, but could be logical ‘infill plot’.
897	16	408 Plot constituting undeveloped frontage of Croft Way – also owned by Magnus Trustees and being promoted for residential development by us. Development would effectively complete existing cul-de-sac. It is close to village centre, and would avoid any significant landscape impact.
897	17	401, 409, 484, 405, 404 – Large edge of settlement sites - significant landscape impact. Nos. 404, 405 and 484 particularly prominent from A631 (affecting wider setting of historic core).
897	18	402 & 403 – Both sites suffer from constrained highways access – NCC objection. Also prominently located on edge of settlement – landscape impact, and relatively distant from core.
897	19	475 Small site constrained by mature trees, heritage sensitivities and poor access.
897	20	476 Garden area forming immediate setting of Listed Building.
897	21	5.3. In comparison to the above sites it can be seen that the subject site is more centrally located than most. It can be readily made accessible from the existing highways network, and its development as envisaged would have positive impacts on built heritage and the wider landscape. Furthermore, it has the potential to offer a modestly sized residential development with particularly high standards of amenity. It has no significant constraints.
897	22	4.1. It is considered that the subject site, which currently lies outside the Everton settlement envelope, but immediately adjacent to the established built up residential area, constitutes a most suitable opportunity to round off the form of the existing settlement. 4.2. The site identified at Appendix 1, measures approximately 0.19 ha. It is situated to the east of the existing residential cul-de-sac of Croft Way, which, with its subsidiary Croft Farm Close, presently comprises a development of 25 detached dwellings of mixed size and form at the eastern edge of the village of Everton. Although the majority of Croft Way is built up on both sides of the highway, the site occupies a frontage of approximately 52 metres which is not presently developed. The proposed development would therefore complete and round-off the existing built form of the settlement, utilising the existing highway access provided by Croft Way, so maximising the efficient use of existing infrastructure. It would not involve any significant protrusion into the surrounding countryside. 4.3. We have previously made representations to the Core Strategy concerning the site (referred to as no. 408 in the SHLAA), and for ease of reference summarise its key characteristics and development potential below.
897	23	4.4. The site constitutes part of a larger field of approximately 1.8 ha. It is currently classified as Grade 3 Agricultural Land and used as grass pasture. 4.5. Access to the field is gained separately from Roe Lane, with which Croft Way forms a T-junction to the north. Therefore development of the subject site would not affect the agricultural viability of the remaining majority of the field.
897	24	4.6. The site is grass covered but contains no vegetation of any particular significance. The only tree is a small, relatively young self-seeded ash tree on the western boundary. The majority of that boundary is open, although there is some hawthorn in poor condition. While it is most likely that such vegetation would have to be removed to facilitate the development, it is sparse and not of good quality. New planting in association with the proposed development would enhance its setting and the ecological value of the site, far outweighing the loss of the specimens referred to.
897	25	4.7. The site is relatively flat, and stands approximately half a metre below the level of the existing highway, at between five and ten metres AOD.
897	26	4.8. The site is not within a defined flood zone and appears to be free draining.

Reference number		Answer
Responde nt	Comme nt	
897	27	4.9. The site is not within or adjacent to any area of designated landscape, ecological or other scientific value. It is of no particular landscape significance, and its current use is likely to mean that it is of low ecological value. 4.10. It should be noted that as the proposed development would effectively complete an existing cul-de-sac, it would not involve any significant intrusion into the surrounding countryside, and would thus be of very limited landscape impact.
897	28	4.11. The site is not within, nor in the setting of, any Listed Building, Conservation Area or other heritage asset. There is no reason to believe that the site is of any particular archaeological significance.
897	29	4.12. The site is not constrained by the presence of any utilities infrastructure. There is a small sewage pumping station to the north east of the site, although this is predominantly an underground facility, and has no bearing on the high standard of residential amenity offered by the site.
897	30	4.13. The field, of which the subject site forms part, is crossed by a public right of way. This public footpath enters the field at the gateway to Roe Lane, near Linden House, and continues in a south-southwesterly direction to the south-west corner of the field. It should be noted that the map of definitive rights of way held on the Nottinghamshire County Council website has been checked, and it can be confirmed that the formal right of way lies entirely to the east of the subject site and will not be affected by the proposed development. 4.14. We have noted that the authority's SHLAA document makes reference to there being two footpaths which cross the site. On the basis of our investigations to date we consider this to be incorrect.
897	31	4.15. The sustainability credentials of the site are enhanced by the fact that it lies within 10 minutes walk of the bus route that passes through Everton.
897	32	4.16. It is envisaged that the site could be viably developed for six dwellings (three semi-detached pairs) which would help to meet the diversity of housing demand in rural parts of Bassetlaw. Such a development would be relatively low density, but this would be fully compatible with the existing pattern of development in this part of Everton. 4.17. There is also sufficient space within the site to facilitate the provision of private gardens and driveways with off-road parking for each dwelling. 4.18. Given the form of development envisaged, we consider that the site may have particular potential for the development of affordable housing. We have previously referred to productive discussions with the ACIS group, who as a Registered Social Landlord has previously expressed particular interest in the site. The Core Strategy acknowledges that the need for affordable housing is a serious issue. Furthermore, evidence that there is a specific need in Everton has been provided through a Housing Needs Survey, commissioned by the Parish Council in 2006. Bassetlaw District Council has also acknowledged its support in principle for the provision of a small affordable housing development in Everton - a matter which has previously been discussed with Richard Schofield, Planning Policy & Conservation Manager.
897	33	406 Large visibly prominent gap site, but could be logical 'infill plot'.
897	34	477 Yard – also in ownership of Magnus Trustees, and being separately promoted for residential development by us. Well related to services in village core. Development would involve removal of unsightly portal buildings so enhancing setting of nearby Listed Buildings and improving eastern approach to historic core.
898	1	Yes, provided the methodology does not lead to a situation where the input from professional planners is undermined
898	2	Option A
898	3	The consultation paper indicates Bassetlaw far exceeds the amount of development that could be accommodated, particularly in rural areas, and the Council will not be allocating every site mentioned in the document.
898	4	Gringley has already accommodated 63 new houses as a result of the new build on the former detention centre and the impact of this development, which is significant in proportion to the size of the village, is yet to be realised. I believe Gringley has contributed more than its fair share of residential development and that further housing would be detrimental to the character of the village and the conservation area.
898	5	If further development were to take place I support the views expressed by the resident's questionnaire, that infilling between development boundary lines should be avoided.
898	6	Development of sites 134 and 135 would constitute significant infill and over development within the conservation area, eliminating greenfield space.
898	7	Reiterating my response to Q76 I feel there is no justification for further development on sites 134/135.
898	8	Gringley Parish Plan 2004-2014 identifies narrow lanes with grass verges and banks topped by low walls or hedges together with the historic retention of gaps between buildings that provide views both in and out of the village as being special features which form an integral part of the village character. Development of proposed sites 134 and 135 would compromise these special features.
898	9	Access to site 135 is via Low Street, an extremely narrow lanes without a footpath and space only enough to allow a single vehicle to pass. Low Street provides a thoroughfare from the most densely populated areas of the village and the A631 to the Playing Field and the Chesterfield Canal amenities as well as providing access to farms and farm land in the Middle Bridges area. Development of site 135 would increase traffic levels and cause a safety hazard, particularly with vehicles entering and leaving the site. With restricted visibility, vehicles rounding the steep bend from Cross Hill into Low Street would find it difficult to avoid the hazard of cars leaving the site. Furthermore, vehicles may be tempted to park on Low Street should insufficient parking be available on the site, thus restricting access for emergency services and other large service vehicles.
898	10	Drainage problems at the junction of Low Street and Horsewell Street have never been resolved satisfactorily and since there is no provision for mains surface water drainage in the village significant runoff from the elevated site 135 is bound to cause flooding at this junction.
898	11	The conservation area is characterised by many greenfield areas which separate existing houses and farm buildings. Development of the site 134 and 135 would result in loss of green space, pasture land and ecological habitats and further endanger the village's conservation.
898	12	Should either site be developed it would set a precedent for similar spaces within the conservation area to be developed. Of particular concern would be the potential infill of the adjacent green field areas bounded by Low Street and Little Lane.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
898	13	Planning permission for site 135 has been sought on many occasions in the past and on each occasion plans have been rejected for good reason since the proposals for development were considered as if in the countryside. In relation to past applications, which went to appeal, the Inspector considered that any development here would be harmful to the rural settlement policies at that time and would be harmful to the conservation area and character of the village. These criteria still apply.
898	14	I support the view that the open spaces indicated should be preserved and that as much open space as possible should be maintained within conservation areas.
898	15	G&T sites should be concentrated in and around existing sites to enable efficient and cost effective delivery of essential services to those sites.
898	16	Again, transit and traveller pitches should be provided together to enable efficient and cost effective delivery of essential services to those sites
898	17	Houses in the proposed development would overlook, overshadow and lead to a loss of privacy for the existing neighbouring dwellings.
898	18	The proposed open space/garden would require maintenance by the local parish, which would place an additional financial burden on the parish council and its residents for no obvious benefit.
898	19	If the area on the plan buffering the existing owners property from the development, which is labelled 'Not To Be Developed To Maintain Historic Settlement Features', then surely the whole site should be conserved to maintain the villages special historic settlement features.
898	20	The outcome of the Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation exercise is still awaited and no decisions should be made regarding this land until all responses from Gringley residents have been carefully considered.
899	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
899	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
899	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
899	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
899	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
899	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
899	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
899	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
899	9	I object to this planning proposal as I know there is also of wildlife in the proposed area. I know there are wild deer and at least two badger sets near this area. A lot of people aren't aware of this. As you can understand, the few people who are aware do not want to make this public knowledge, due to their habitant being disrupted. I feel that if these houses were built, all this would be lost.
900	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
900	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
900	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
900	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
900	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
900	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
900	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
900	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
901	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
901	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
901	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
901	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
901	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
901	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
901	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
901	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
902	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
902	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
902	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
902	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
902	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
902	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
902	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
902	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
903	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
903	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
903	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
903	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
903	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
903	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
903	7	Access to town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore a result of this development.
903	8	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
903	9	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
904	1	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35. This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.
904	2	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
904	3	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
904	4	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
904	5	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
904	6	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
904	7	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
904	8	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
904	9	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
905	1	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35. This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.
905	2	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
905	3	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
905	4	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
905	5	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
905	6	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
905	7	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
905	8	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
905	9	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
905	10	I) Insufficient employment opportunities. Worksop does not provide enough employment opportunities for local people at current population levels, 700 additional homes will only make this situation worse leading to further unemployment within the local area.
905	11	J) Increase of teenage groups and crime. This is due to the lack of out of school activities made available for the several thousands of teenage Worksop residents. An additional 700 homes will undoubtedly make a current situation of teenage groups congregating on street corners and outside local shops even worse, this will cause distress to vulnerable and elderly residents.
906	1	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35. This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
906	2	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
906	3	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
906	4	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
906	5	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
906	6	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
906	7	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
906	8	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
906	9	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
907	1	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35. This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.
907	2	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
907	3	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
907	4	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
907	5	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
907	6	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
907	7	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
907	8	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
907	9	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
907	10	I) Insufficient employment opportunities. Worksop does not provide enough employment opportunities for local people at current population levels, 700 additional homes will only make this situation worse leading to further unemployment within the local area.
907	11	J) Increase of teenage groups and crime. This is due to the lack of out of school activities made available for the several thousands of teenage Worksop residents. An additional 700 homes will undoubtedly make a current situation of teenage groups congregating on street corners and outside local shops even worse, this will cause distress to vulnerable and elderly residents.
908	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any houses at site 35 based on the below reasons: The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. Any increase in housing on the estate will make this situation intolerable and dangerous to residents and visitors.
908	2	Increased traffic levels on the estate generally reducing the quality of our environment, increasing noise levels, pollution and increasing danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
908	3	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
908	4	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
908	5	The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
908	6	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment.
908	7	This bridleway is used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users. The loss of this countryside would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Plantation.
908	8	Our local shops which are sited off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, especially as one of the shops became an ASDA. Additional housing will cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas.
908	9	Our local schools (primary, secondary and school based nurseries) are already at capacity.
909	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
909	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
909	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
909	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area.
909	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
909	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
909	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
909	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
910	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
910	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
910	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
910	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area.
910	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
910	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
910	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
910	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
911	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
911	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
911	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
911	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area.
911	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
911	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
911	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
911	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
911	9	We bought our house so it would be peaceful and away from built up areas, where we are is bang next to the new site, this would be horrendous for us to live next to, the noise, pollution, congestion.
911	10	It would completely ruin where we live, are property would lose value, it would be too busy. Who would compensate the loss of our nice lands and where would we live? No one! We just have to suffer. Please consider not using this site.
912	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
912	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
912	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
912	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area.
912	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
912	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
912	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
912	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
913	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
913	2	We disagree to any further development sites being allocated in this village on the basis that already a new estate of 68 houses has only recently commenced. We feel that this is more than enough additional housing in a village of this size.
913	3	Taking into account the inevitable steady addition of houses being developed by existing house owners on their own land, there is no need to allow for the building of any more concentrated development.
913	4	BAS0134 is a disused farm building in an area of particular rural beauty. We have no objections to seeing this developed into a single property, but to see this demolished in favour of new build would be a desperate shame and would spoil the look and feel of the village.
913	5	In addition, this is a site that we have considered on a more personal level for purchasing, should it ever be available to buy, for the development of a village farm shop/tea room (as well as a home). There are no such facilities in the village at the moment and we feel that there is a need here that we may be able to fulfil should the land be made available to us for such a use. In doing so, we would be able to develop the property entirely in keeping with its surrounding area and even, with the farm shop, bring it back to a working property.
913	6	BAS0135 is a more suitable site for development of maybe 2 or 3 houses as it nestles in between other properties and is off the main road and therefore less visible.
913	7	However, any more houses than that would impact on the amount of land around each with the surrounding houses in that area.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
913	8	Not at this time
913	9	Yes we feel it is absolutely essential to maintain both of these areas.
913	10	We feel that any new sites should be concentrated in and around existing sites. Facilities are already in place to service the needs of the travellers plus this option would reduce any conflict between travelling communities and home owning/residential communities.
914	1	Yes
914	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
914	3	Yes, plus the village needs cheaper housing for younger and older people.
914	4	site 480 is the best site for development.
914	5	Yes, the green spaces in the village need protecting from any development.
915	1	Not seen it
915	2	Yes, I believe Harworth needs further housing and industrial development to reduce our unemployment and social problems.
915	3	Site 192 is only rough land so this would be the best site to build on.
915	4	All sites are good, close to the A1 and away from the main area of Harworth.
915	5	No, employment would be most appropriate there.
915	6	Yes, we need to keep our open spaces.
915	7	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
916	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
916	2	I agree to enough land for at least 4 new houses but no more than 4
916	3	Site 281 is the only site in my view that is acceptable, as this is a small extension of the village and is on a road with good access
916	4	I would like to make the Council aware of the highway dangers relating to Lound Low road. The sites particularly 275, 452 and all others that are based around this road. Sutton's Main Street has a right and then a left angled bend - on the left angled bend there is the right turn into Lound Low road, when turning into this road it is necessary to wait for oncoming traffic before turning. This is a dangerous action, as those who do not adhere to the speed limit and those unaware of the junction ahead around the bend are very likely to hit the stationary vehicle turning right. Conversely, traffic turning right from Lound Low road onto main street again are in danger from the speed of the driver coming around the left angled bend also from oncoming traffic from Mattersey direction as there is a slight kink in the road so as to obscure oncoming traffic. Further Lound Low road also has a left and right angled bend, the council does not support this road in bad weather, it does not grit this road. It would seem stupid to build more houses in such an area that has such bad infrastructure compared to other areas that are more conducive to safe traffic areas.
916	5	I believe that open spaces are a valuable and ecological asset to local community life and I would not like to see our villages or towns losing their character.
916	6	I think it preferable to site in new locations, as this gives less concentration of clique mentality and allows the smaller sites to be accepted more readily by the community.
916	7	I believe they should be sited together. As it has been widely known that travelling pitches are left in a bad/unkept state, residential sites may hopefully transfer some sense of order to their own kind. Also, they tend to deal their own kind better than the Council would ever succeed in doing.
917	1	I agree with the criteria used.
917	2	Worksop should not be developed as an overspill site for surrounding towns and cities. There are already empty industrial units around the town, so why do we need more. Houses should only be built for the existing Worksop population, with a maximum of 600 new houses.
917	3	If Housing is needed it should be built on sites 39/W10 and site 28/W6 as these sites are close to existing employment areas.
917	4	future employment sites should be 39/W10 and 28/W6
917	5	1 would support the allocation of mixed use sites 39/W10 and 28/W6 as these are close to existing mixed use sites, and already have the majority of infra-structure needed.
917	6	all the existing open spaces should be protected as amenities for the town.
917	7	I agree with this feedback. If development is necessary it should be done close to existing mixed use sites, on sites 39/W10 and 28/W9
917	8	I do not agree to the development of site 4/W9 as this is greenfield land and has no existing infra-structure.
917	9	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
917	10	REMOVED
917	11	Transit and residential pitches should be sited together. this would keep any potential problems at one place
918	1	I believe that location 35 is not suitable
918	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
919	1	Yes but believe that more prominence should be given to Heritage Assets Protected areas and flora/fauna, ancient woodlands and local nature reserves when they in areas adjacent to similar assets e.g. area 218 adjacent to Coach Wood Green

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
919	2	The housing needs should be balanced against employment actually available currently the area has low employment and this should be returned to average levels before providing large housing developments
919	3	35,8,4,28
919	4	4, 28 w13
919	5	option 2 it is more balanced to employment needs in current and likely future climate
919	6	Yes particularly areas 70 around shireoaks and also believe part of area 218 which is currently part of Coachwood green should be added. As treasurer of Woodlands and Coachwood Green friends society I wholeheartedly support their aims to preserve this natural asset and further develop the adjacent Marina site.
919	7	The current areas of coach wood green currently in are 218 particularly the woodlands should be added to 70/8
919	8	Yes wholeheartedly particularly the need for a restaurant adjacent to Marina and near village to capture future canal traffic and cuckoo way walkers and cyclists on NR6
919	9	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
919	10	Use existing
919	11	Together
920	1	Yes
920	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
920	3	I think East Markham could support more housing, especially if they were smaller developments with mid range housing.
920	4	Building houses on larger plots increases the volume of traffic moving in and out of those areas. Houses on plots that would perhaps allow privately owned vehicles to park on their own drives and not on the main roads through the village although many people park on the road even if they do have a drive to park on
920	5	Sites 491 & 523 with less through traffic along the road to the front of these plots, also there is no footpath to cross when entering and leaving the site.
920	6	No
920	7	Yes
920	8	REMOVED
920	9	No idea what impact these pitches have on the community if provided together or separately
920	10	No
921	1	Harworth and Bircotes. I am a landowner of some of the plots named in the LDF, these are plots 207,205,193 (part) and I am a tenant farmer on plots 193 (other part), 180.
921	2	I feel that the further development of the town will provide more affordable housing for younger people starting on the property ladder, bring more security to our local schools funding and revitalise our town especially with the much needed facelift to the Scrooby Road shopping area.
921	3	I would like several of my plots actively considered for planning, these are 205, 207 and 193 (part) however I do have some concerns about development on a couple of other plots stated below.
921	4	I the Landowner actively want to sell plots 205, 207 and 193 (part)
921	5	205,206,358,359 are all flat green sites so no demolition would be required they are ready to go with respect to building.
921	6	Plots 205, 358, 359- would be a natural extension to the pre-existing Common Lane housing area with these plots being edge of town farmland. There is excellent access to strategic road networks. There is a natural boundary with the A1 around the far perimeter of these sites.
921	7	Plot 207 is also edge of town farmland and would provide a natural extension to an established row of houses. Again being situated on the main road through the village it has excellent road access. There is also a natural boundary to the village at the far end of this plot, created by the railway line.
921	8	Plots 207, 206,205, 359, 358 provide low grade agricultural land, and are only suitable for growing wheat/ barley, which are low price crops. Whereas plots 182, 194, 187,191 are high grade agricultural land, and are used to grow carrots etc. high value crops as they have excellent irrigation systems in place
921	9	On plots 205, 358, 359 we have on going issues with people fly tipping, dumping garden waste and household waste in the fields as fields are unused. Building on these plots would end the expensive and time consuming job of clearing up after fly tippers.
921	10	Obviously we make our living farming we own some land however we have been tenant farmers on plots 193(part) and 180 since 1895. If building was approved on these plots we would automatically loose our faming rights over this land which is owned by the church. This would have a detrimental effect on farm income. We have invested a large amount of money in last 2 years stock fencing both of these fields. Even more money was invested in 193 (part) field to ensure the public right of way was maintained in accordance to what Bassetlaw Council (James Russ) Area Rights of Way Officer stipulated we must preserve for the villagers enjoyment. This cost us approximately £5,000. Having been a Tennant Farming family on this land for over 100 years I feel our interest and business deserves to be protected. Surely it would be contradictory to put a negative burden on our farm when at the consultation meeting at the Blacksmiths Arms on January 24 2012, it was announced that the new to open ASDA had been downscaled to exclude a florist, newsagent and pharmacy in order to protect pre-existing businesses in the village, surely a precedent has been set and our long standing business must be protected too.
921	11	Plot 193 is actually 2 parts with different owners so will need re-identifying on the Issues and Options Consultation Paper map.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
921	12	We already experience flooding around the Main Street area as the drains are not large enough to cope currently. So any further residential development north of this area would overload this system further- eg. plots 182, 194, 192
921	13	There is a large local equestrian community, however hacking on the local roads is already dangerous with DHL lorries speeding up Tickhill road, and Boy racers from Bircotes using Main Street for racing, we have a distinct lack of Bridleways in this area- the old railway line could be converted into a fantastic Bridleway which would also allow the local community to walk dogs safely and people to enjoy family walks out.
921	14	A new Public house in Bircotes to stop the stream of drunks from Bircotes to the Blacksmith arms on an evening.
921	15	Main Street, Harworth including the crossroads has severe flooding after 12 years of heavy rain and after 20 minutes of thunderstorm rain. I have lived in this flood plain from birth until 1973 when I converted my house and lifted it almost 2 meters to escape the flood water. The reason for this flooding is because the surface water drain is inadequate and the Harworth dyke which flows past the Churchyard is unable to take nay more water from further housing developments without extensive widening and depending as far as the River Torne. The flooding has increased in recent years owing to housing development and residents creating hard standings n gardens for cars. It is vital that future development does not have its water discharging into any drain or culvert which conveys water under Main Street. The alternative is for water to be conveyed to the River Idle – east of Bircotes or to the Willoughby Dyke which flows South West of the A1M and which has the capacity for taking further water.
921	16	Regarding further housing development to the north and east of Harworth/Bircotes – plots 182, 194, 187and 191 - this area is prime agricultural land capable of growing excellent crops such as cereals, potatoes, carrots and brassicas, due to the large fields and underground irrigation and should not be built upon.
921	17	The western side of plot 182 is totally unacceptable for housing development due to the close proximity of Harworth Sewage Works. Various improvements and modernisation in the past of the Sewage Works has failed to stem the stench.
921	18	Plots 180 and 204 are the site of the ancient settlement of Harworth where foundations still remain. This site should be listed as a site of “special archaeological interest”. The Church stands well-appointed above this field in an attractive and pleasant position and building here would have a great impact on public visual amenity.
921	19	The Western end of lot 193 is a grass paddock where horses and cattle graze. There is a public right of way running diagonally across this field. To build houses here would have a severe impact on the lives of the public including residents and families with children who regularly walk here and enjoy the flora and fauna of the only grass field with a public right of way across it in Harworth.
921	20	Plot 190 is the field which has a Spoil Heap from the Colliery. For 40 years residents and visitors to the area have had to look at this eyesore. The panting of trees and shrubs on this site has created an attractive and peasant environment. It would be detrimental to the people of Harworth and Bircotes to lose this ecological habitats and landscapes in favour of house building.
921	21	With regard to the number of houses required to be built, in my opinion is that planning permission be granted in the west of the village in the past the majority of the development has taken place to the north and the eats. Housing to the West would provide a better balance, plots 358, 359, 205, 206 and 181.l the surface water from such a development would drain into the Willoughby Dyke behind the motorway. These plots are small fields and uneconomic to farm with modern machinery making it ideal for housing development.
921	22	Further housing ought to be infilling within the natural boundary of the village – plots 184, 185, 186 and 188 and the eastern end of 193. All the surface water from these plots should run into soakaways to avoid flooding Harworth village.
921	23	Plot 192 is poor scrubland and should be considered for house building to make up for the number of houses required.
921	24	All the potential protected open spaces coloured green on the map should be retained. I believe the land to the south of the village should be used for industrial land not mixed development,. In my opinion the plots nearest Blyth roundabout should be for storage and distribution and the plots adjacent to the old Glass Bulbs for Industry and employment.
921	25	The land to the North of plot 190 adjacent to Scrooby Road is the site of the Old Brickworks in Harworth (photographs enclosed), I am surprised that this is at the advanced stage of planning permission, because when I was young I remember deep ponds where clay had been taken out. In the years between 1940 and 1955 these deep ponds were then filled in with household refuse by Worksop District Rural Council. The brickyard house and kilns were buried underneath this rubbish in places up to 20ft deep. I fail to see how this site could be suitable for any building planning permission is given. I would not live personally live in a house on this site at any price.
922	1	This question is pointless, it is evident that countless council officers have spent countless hours costing thousands in council tax churning out jargon and acronyms to cover many pages: the average person will be put off and will not read further: maybe this was the intention? Why not just state that the council is required to produce an area development plan and that matters A, B C etc. were taken into account?
922	2	No: the infrastructure of the town is already at breaking point, with traffic problems and capacity problems in local services such as schools. What overall benefit is there to the area of mass development? Most jobs would be out of the area, generating more traffic on an already crippled road system.
922	3	prefer sites 7,512 and 37 as well as small infill sites such as 10,70,71,342
922	4	Brownfield Sites
922	5	The problem with mixed use sites is that the employment available is unlikely to be taken up by the immediate residents, so more traffic generated and does not fit the 'green agenda'
922	6	Many of the proposed sites would potentially be affected by flooding (especially refs 511, 370, 3, 1, 52, 40) and further development of these sites would lead to greater risk of flooding in current housing areas as there would be less open surface for drainage.
922	7	The local infrastructure (especially Bracken Lane/ Grove Coach Road) is inadequate for the current levels of traffic generated by school drop off/pick up and would be totally unsatisfactory if coping with further residential access traffic.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
922	8	There is no surplus capacity at Bracken Lane School - where is envisaged that all the children living in the proposed housing will be schooled? And what about the resultant traffic?
922	9	Sufficient thought also needs to be given to proposed density/parking and garaging - the recent trend for high density 3 storey houses on narrow roads with no frontage and remote parking has led to access problems in Retford (see Albert Road - cars parked on both sides of the road yet somehow double decker buses and other traffic is expected to navigate this hazard)
922	10	Priority should be given to the development of brownfield sites and infill sites, where the overall appearance would be enhanced by new development replacing run down or demolished buildings and the infrastructure is already in place.
922	11	How much extra council tax does the council expect to generate from the proposed developments and how does it propose these monies will be spent? Will any of this benefit existing council tax payers, or can they expect a reduction on council tax as fixed costs are spread over a larger number of council tax payers?
922	12	I believe Retford enjoys good local open spaces and these should be preserved.
922	13	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
922	14	No new locations to ensure no further residents are inconvenienced or areas blighted.
922	15	Together in order that fewer areas affected
923	1	Notification to residents in Harworth & Bircotes should have been done back in November 2011 by a house to house leaflet drop and a meeting back in November or December 2011 not one 7 days before the deadline date. We have round 25 houses on Milne Road and not one person was aware of the proposed plans. Hidden Political agenda??????? Treat the residents of Harworth and Bircotes with a little respect.
923	2	In Bircotes around the Milne Road area there have been 38 houses on the market for over a year. In total you can drive round the whole area and count 68 for sale boards. We have the houses being built on the coal mining land why not upgrade the rabbit warren in Harworth before building more new builds.
923	3	Employment growth if you must but can we keep the aesthetic appearance of the country side which is why many people move into the area away from the cities.
923	4	None of it really but in order of preference 193. 204 180 358 204 232 359 205 181 206 207 190
923	5	H6
923	6	Leisure and retail would bring money into the area from surrounding areas and would be of benefit.
923	7	In and around area 187 which you have proposed for housing there are 3 underground streams 2 of which are piped into the current fields. When we get heavy rain a lot of area 187 becomes waterlogged, in torrential rain it floods down the hill over Bawtry Road.
923	8	For the whole project you mention the infrastructure in respect of road network, sewage etc. But we are in the 21st Century and since the new houses have gone up in Harworth, water pressure has dropped and communication network is better in the outback's of Australia than it is in Harworth and Bircotes. If you want somewhere to develop bring the current up to date with technology by bringing the current populous into the 21st Century.
923	9	Also this area is a corridor of wildlife, adders, Greater spotted woodpeckers, yellow hammers, owls, deer, hare's and large birds of prey are to just name a few.
923	10	If anything needs doing to area 187 it would benefit the ground stability and the area to turn it back into woodland.
923	11	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
923	12	Specify? Sites run by the local council with liaison officers or permission for privately run sites? Be more specific as to who the sites are for - one group of Gypsy's will not necessarily tolerate living alongside another group of travellers.
923	13	together or separately - see above response
923	14	Wherever the sites are located with the different lifestyle to those of established residential areas the sites should be located to avoid site residents being intimidated by the local residents.
924	1	Option A
924	2	I agree that there should be land allocated for 9 houses but no more than that number.
924	3	I couldn't pull up the map. I would prefer a SMALL infill development policy but if that is not practical then land at the top of Spital Road after the Old Police House.
924	4	I am greatly concerned about the capacity of the sewers in Blyth. When it rains heavily water is seen to pour OUT of the manhole covers on Ryton Fields.
924	5	I also have concerns as to how the electricity supply would be affected given that we have frequent power cuts.
924	6	A public footpath runs through 1 of the fields marked and the exits of 2 of the fields, either side of the A1 flyover is extremely dangerous.
924	7	A large development would affect the intrinsic quality of this unique and historic village.
924	8	I agree that the few open spaces in Blyth should be protected.
924	9	Definitely not
924	10	Together to minimise disruption and dis-satisfaction within the district.
924	11	None known
925	1	Option A
925	2	Only 9 houses as any more would spoil the village. At the council meeting it was suggested that low cost housing should be provided for young people to buy in Blyth.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
925	3	I am a young person and I would not buy here because you MUST have a car, you can't go out anywhere large unless you can afford a taxi home. I don't think the planners have got that bit right at all.
925	4	The site near the motor way junction up Spital Road.
925	5	The infrastructure of the village could not cope with any more houses and cars. Already the traffic as a big problem especially the lorries which use the village as a short cut to their destinations
925	6	The character of a relatively small and clearly defined village would be altered should there be large development.
925	7	We often have power cuts and I doubt the electricity supply could cope. Broadband provision is already pathetic.
925	8	There are so few designated open spaces in Blyth that they should be protected at all cost.
925	9	Existing sites. I don't see why you should spoil anymore areas
925	10	Together and keep them in one place.
925	11	None Known
926	1	Site 8 the back of Westerdale. The following issues need to be considered. Any 2 or 3 storey buildings will significantly reduce the light available to current housing.
926	2	The effect on current soak away drainage will damage current facility and cost to householders.
926	3	The prevailing wind direction is South West and therefore all properties currently on site will be adversely affected during the many years of development causing potential health issue to residents and major inconvenience in terms of quality of life including air damage to clothing, gardens and other personal assets.
926	4	Destroying the wooded area and hedgerows will significantly damage the wildlife and specific plant life.
926	5	The value of existing properties will be adversely affected whatever style of housing is built on the site.
926	6	Site 8 is not appropriate for housing development when compared with a number of other sites that will not cause such major dismay to current householders.
926	7	Leave site 8 as agricultural land or develop the wooded area and surround as an area for sedentary leisure
926	8	Focused in just one of the above towns?
926	9	Existing sites
926	10	Together
927	1	Yes but you still appear to have included areas that suffer from flooding despite this being one of the things you list as being why you would exclude an area!
927	2	Areas 511 & 379 flood with surface water from the higher ground nearby
927	3	I do not think we need any more housing other than the suggested amount. Retford desperately needs employers to come into town too much former employment land has been lost to house building. People need jobs.
927	4	I would prefer to see housing development on sites 40, 52, 1, 37 41 27. As far as I am aware these areas have no flooding problems, have roads that would appear to cope with the traffic.
927	5	I strongly object to the areas 511, 370, 489, 488 & 69 being included in the consultation as for much of the year the land is sodden as the fields take the surface water from the nearby much higher land, in times of extreme weather gardens off Grove Coach Road, Bracken Lane, St Helens & St Stephens have flooded including some houses.
927	6	Planning has been declined before (1995) in this area flooding problems being one of the reasons why it was rejected?
927	7	I would like to see employment land to be developed on the outskirts of the town and feel development could be made to the north and south.
927	8	Site 10 should remain employment land and not be turned into housing.
927	9	No preference
927	10	Retford suffers from gridlock at peak times, has some kind of ring road ever been considered to help development in future years?
927	11	If you wished to engage the whole population in this consultation then you should have issued letters to each household in the District, not everyone reads the Retford Times, receives a free paper or listens to Trax FM. Your document is cumbersome and I fear some people would have given up after 2 pages, believe it or not there are still lots of households who do not have a computer or access to the internet particularly elderly residents.
927	12	Green areas in the town should be protected particularly Kings Park and all current playing/leisure areas.
927	13	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
927	14	I think they should, it would make economic sense the services are currently there and would not have to be provided in any new designated area.
927	15	Why not together reasons as before economic, cheaper to provide.
928	1	I am sorry, I do not understand the question you are asking - this question does not make any sense to me. I do not find this questionnaire very user friendly.
928	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
928	3	I agree that any new houses built in Gringley on the Hill should be detached dwellings with gardens, in keeping with the village character, unlike the housing estate placed on the detention centre site, which would be more in place in suburbia.
928	4	I am in favour of individual dwellings but not in favour of housing estates.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
928	5	I think either site has potential but these sites should not then exclude the tasteful build of a property somewhere else, so these sites should not take up all of the numbers, by cramming too many houses too close together.
928	6	The new housing estate on the detention centre site has vastly too many houses on it and would be better placed in a town. The houses have no gardens, I have already seen children playing on the road outside it. Planning has just been passed for Pollybell Farms on the basis that all their articulated lorries use this once quiet road. So you see our village is pretty much spoiled now. So many extra cars, children with nowhere to play, dogs, litter, and people move here still thinking it is a quiet place to be.
928	7	Yes, I think the open spaces marked on the map should be protected.
928	8	I think gypsy sites should stay in existing sites because they destroy wherever they go.
928	9	Lets keep them all together, then they can fall out with themselves not everyone else.
928	10	I am not aware of any.
929	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
929	2	Yes, and some low cost housing for younger people
929	3	165 and 164 are most suitable, but sites near to main street do flood.
929	4	The village green and play area need to be protected.
930	1	Yes
930	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
930	3	Yes at least 14
930	4	280 is my preferred site for development.
930	5	Site near to the centre of the village flood.
930	6	the village green spaces should be preserved.
930	7	Existing sites
930	8	Separately
931	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
931	2	No, Sutton has seen enough new housing over the past few years.
931	3	No sites should be allocated for housing
931	4	The village has over 10 properties for sale.
931	5	Yes, I agree with the above
931	6	Existing sites in Worksop. Daneshill site should be improved.
931	7	Separately. Different gypsy cultures do not mix well.
932	1	Yes
932	2	Yes, town has significant issues that need addressing. I support the aim to regenerate Harworth. The new development at the colliery is a benefit. The town does need more shops and a improved leisure centre to accommodate the expansion.
932	3	162 and 168 would be natural extensions to Harworth
932	4	The sites nearest to the Town so that people can walk to work. An increased bus service would also help.
932	5	I would support further retail development.
932	6	No development should occur around any of the towns woodlands.
932	7	These need to be improved but also should be protected.
932	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
932	9	Existing sites.
932	10	None
933	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
933	2	Yes over an 18 year period, this does not seem high at all.
933	3	Site 237 would be suitable for a small extension
933	4	The road network in Wheatley is not suitable for a large development, but should support 12 new houses.
933	5	Yes the village hall and school should be protected.
934	1	Yes
934	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
934	3	No, we believe the detention centre development will be enough new housing for Gringley.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
934	4	No other sites should be developed.
934	5	Roads will struggle to take all new traffic from the detention centre site, so anymore would put further pressure on the roads.
934	6	Yes, the village recreation ground should be protected.
935	1	I think location 35 is unsuitable because it will mean a loss of privacy for residents living directly in front of site 35 because the land is significantly raised.
935	2	The traffic generation will increase to a dangerous level as traffic is already extremely congested at peak times on this estate.
935	3	In particular, the Ashes Park entrance junction is heavily congested at times and would need the installation of traffic lights to cope with the added pressure a new estate would bring.
935	4	There are currently established hedgerows running alongside the boundary of site 35. The removal of this hedgerow would mean a loss of habitat for wildlife and also damage to existing residents' fences. This hedgerow needs yearly maintenance, which is currently carried out by residents who would lose access if this development were to go ahead.
935	5	There is an inadequate infrastructure to support this development as the local shops and schools are already over-capacitated.
935	6	If this development were to go ahead this would need to be addressed to maintain an adequate quality of living for residents. We feel the open space has a vital role to promote healthy living and prevent illness in the existing community. It would mean a significant loss of amenity for residents who use this open space daily. For example, dog walking and running to name a few.
935	7	We feel that site 4 & W9 is in a better suited location for any forthcoming development as it is a much larger area of land and it would not interrupt the lifestyle of as many residents.
935	8	I think that site 35 should be protected from future development proposals because it is a valuable open space used by the local community. Any development on this site would be detrimental to the quality of life for residents.
935	9	Option A.
935	10	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
935	11	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
935	12	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
935	13	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
935	14	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
935	15	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
935	16	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
935	17	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
936	1	I agree with the criteria but don't know how it was implemented. Was it a group of self interested parties or a group of unbiased people. Who were/are they?
936	2	This is asking for my belief (what ever that is supposed to mean) without giving details of the benefits and who will benefit.
936	3	Since Area 35 is close to me I will make comment. I'm not for or against development of this area. Because Gateford is mainly residential it would make more sense to use this for residential than another uses.
936	4	If this is to be the case, I would ask that access roads do not link up to those immediately south (i.e. Gateford)as this would change them from quiet dead ends into busy through routes. The map shows the roads as not connected, that is how they should stay.
936	5	The telephone service in my area for Internet access (speed)is very poor. If a development does take place this would be an opportunity to upgrade telephone network this and Gateford area so both new and current residents would benefit.
936	5	Gypsies should be welcomed anywhere, so long as they abide by the same planning rules as everyone else.
936	6	No preference most seem appropriate
936	7	No preference most seem appropriate
936	8	Yes most if not all of these are within residential areas and it is important to preserve the setting of these residences.
936	9	Other than poor internet speed in Gateford and I believe from what other people have told me in other areas too.
936	10	If "feedback" is the Bassetlaw Local Development Framework document then yes from my perspective it seems very appropriate.
936	11	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
936	12	I do not know where the current sites are so cannot really make comment.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
936	13	Yes If they are together I can see transit areas becoming residential.
937	1	Unsure what this means?
937	2	No I feel that we should still within the existing allocations.
937	3	I would prefer the sites numbers 45 & 371 & 26 to be developed. This allows Shireoaks to retain the village feel , whilst still providing extra housing. A57 would take the majority of the traffic and it shouldn't increase traffic through the village.
937	4	w13
937	5	28 & w6 because the majority of traffic to this could via the A57 ,without impacting on the village of Shireoaks.
937	6	Using 195, 343 & w5 would drastically change the environment which is currently open fields and green space .Adversely affect the feel of the village ,611 houses put there would be disastrous for area
937	7	The road to the village could not support the level of traffic this size of development would create.
937	8	Yes , they should be protected. I feel that none of the open spaces identified should be used in future development it is vital to protect the 'country feel' to the area of Shireoaks. These green spaces help support this after years of pollution etc. caused by the colliery. The Cornwall Road estate as many young families and elderly people and the open spaces create a much better area for these residents.
937	9	Much more could be made of the Chesterfield canal and the Marina in Shireoaks , there is ample space for car parking and maybe a pub/restaurant would encourage more people to visit.
937	10	Please consider the loss of the sites that you are proposing, and consider in particular what the impact of building 611 houses on the edge of an historical village like Shireoaks.
937	11	Yes
937	12	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
937	13	In and around existing sites.
937	14	Together.
937	15	no
938	1	Re screening criteria for 'Preferred options stage' criteria 3 has title including 'economic development opportunities' but the detailed narrative talks about employment land targets. If the criteria is concerned with new Employment this should be specified. i.e. Economic development does not always equate to employment
938	2	Identified and unresolved constraints'. How do Residents see what has already been noted/discussed between Promoter's of a Site and the Council. It will be in the Promoter's interest to understate the constraints, and understate scale of resolution. How does the criteria ensure All constraints are captured, including those proposed by Residents?
938	3	'Facilities of value to the community'. How do the criteria allow Residents to assess the value of these, against the impact on them of a proposed Site development, and the cost/impact of a Promoter's plan to resolve the constraint. How does the criteria allow for measuring possible impact on some residents of a development near them, against the benefits for other people in the Town of new facilities elsewhere?
938	4	A fundamental part of this criteria should be full visibility of all possible constraints, plans to resolve, facilities of value being offered by the Promoter/Developer
938	5	No. The Town should take it's equitable share of Bassetlaw's requirement, as should all other rural centres and surrounding villages. Rural centres / other centres should not be able to take less housing than proposed for them, as expense of Retford Town taking it.
938	6	Sites 364, 41. Have better access to/from main road network (A1), and to secondary school/post16. Avoids further congestion crossing Town centre/use of Arlington Way
938	7	Sites 51,571, 572; Have better access to/from main road network (A1), and to secondary school/post 16. Avoids further congestion crossing Town centre/use of Arlington Way
938	8	Sites 1,52, Have better access to/from main road network (A1), and to secondary school/post 16. Avoids further congestion crossing Town centre/use of Arlington Way
938	9	51/571/572/R6: Land northwest of Retford; access to main routes without crossing Town centre/Arlington Way. Site 41, 53 & 364;access to main routes without crossing Town centre/Arlington Way.
938	10	51/571/572/R6, 41, 53 & 364. Benefit of mixed Sites is that housing provided in same location as new employment
938	11	I would not want to see any further housing development that needs access to/from London Road. This road (and access to it)is already heavily congested at peak times due to commuters travelling to north of Retford, school journeys to schools on north side of Retford, and those wanting to work in the town centre. Closure of the A1 northbound south of Retford bring traffic down London Road
938	12	Open spaces should not be permanently protected unless they are properly maintained as such; e.g. Kings Park, Oakland's playing fields. Other 'waste-land' spaces should be re-considered for possible development each time further development has to be looked. Open spaces being farm/agricultural land are just as important to some residents.
938	13	Assuming this questions relates to 'Opportunity sites' 24 & 44: Land east of Retford. They should be developed if there are community benefits, and the financial cost borne by the Council (and therefore taxpayers)is justifiable. I have not specific development in mind
938	14	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
938	15	Concentrate on existing Sites. Allows these communities to concentrate together, and any council services to be concentrated (not duplicated/replicated for several locations)
938	16	Provide together; Allows these communities to concentrate together, and any council services to be concentrated (not duplicated/replicated for several locations). However, it may be better to have concentrated residential pitch Site, and concentrated Transit pitch; both not several of both types.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
938	17	I also wanted to raise my concerns about potential sites 3, 370 and 511. Any potential sites (which I expect would include these) that need access to/from London Road in and around Bracken Lane or Grove Coach Road, or further south of these, would add even more congestion to traffic using London Road. and real difficulty exiting Bracken Lane/Grove Coach Road.
938	18	In addition, potential site 370 has suffered from significant flooding.
939	1	Yes i do believe in growth(housing and employment).But where there is future developments(housing)you must include better facilities, not like the Gateford development where there is nothing for the children to do.
939	2	I think location 35 is unsuitable
939	3	Gateford estate 1999- Council tax money received ????? Facilities Zero. Location 35 Council tax money ?????? Facilities ????????
939	4	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
940	1	I do not think that Worksop should be allocated more housing. There is not enough employment within the Worksop area for the current population of Worksop and more housing would only make this situation worse. Under the current economic climate employment is unlikely to increase. Therefore negate the need for more housing in Worksop.
940	2	none
940	3	Any sites that are to be used for employment should not be allocated near any housing
940	4	none
940	5	Yes, there should be protected open spaces between Worksop and other surrounding towns and villages, in order to keep individual identities. Farm land, fields and woods are the only way to keep these boundaries separate.
940	6	In particular I do not agree with any further housing being allocated to the back of the St Annes Estate off Mansfield Road, Worksop (I understand this is proposed site number 9, which is currently farming land).
940	7	There are already problems with access/exit to the St Annes Estate. A regular build up of traffic trying to leave the estate via the two exists, one onto the roundabout and the other further up Mansfield Road. There are regular queue's of traffic all the way up Mansfield Road to get into Worksop. Building more properties here would only cause more congestion.
940	8	There would also be an effect on the current wildlife within this area.
940	9	In general there is not sufficient local amenities such as schools, health centres, hospitals etc. to accommodate for anymore housing in Worksop.
940	10	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
940	11	none
941	1	I would like to disagree with the categorization within Criterion 4. Criterion 4 states that 'consequently this assessment will consider all grade 3 sites as being of the same quality'. Why therefore are grade 3 sites automatically grouped with grade 3 or 4? Is it not as easily rewritten to show grade 3 sites in the same class as 1&2?
941	2	I believe the numbers to be correct if not higher than necessary.
941	3	I would like to disagree with the proposal to develop any housing on site 35. I have written a letter to discuss this in more detail.
941	4	I am not in a position to know the details behind any other sites proposed and therefore am unwilling to make any suggestions.
941	5	I personally know of no objection to sites W12 & W1 - it seems reasonable to develop these area's for further industrial use.
941	6	I have no comment
941	7	Parts of area 35 are designated as a 'mature landscaped area'. Owday Woods, rough Piece and Owday plantation are sites of importance for nature conservation. Many people from the Gateford area and from outside the area use the bridleway from Montford road. Therefore I would suggest that the whole of area 35 should be seen as a 'valued open space' and protected as such.
941	8	This land should be used to encourage recreation tourism as much as possible and used to enhance the area as well as its access and amenities e.g. parking provision for use of the canal etc.
941	9	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
941	10	I believe additional capacity should be concentrated around existing sites
941	11	I don't know enough on this subject to comment.
942	1	Greater acknowledgement should be given to the environmental impact of the proposed plans, e.g. site 3 and the locality is home to a great deal of wildlife, walking the public footpath we often see buzzards, barn owls, skylarks, foxes, monkjack deer in addition to the more usual wildlife such as rabbits, butterflies, birds etc. In our garden which backs onto site 3 we have seen a great crested newt
942	2	The areas suggested on the map currently marked as brown field sites on the outskirts of Retford are those which previous land owners have applied for planning permission and already been rejected for good reason. It appears that the proposed planning sites are randomly based on these
942	3	No. Additional housing would not improve Retford as a market town, it would become oversized and lose its character. There are considerable building developments already in progress, e.g. in Ordsall and others already agreed for planning e.g. back of Morrison's
942	4	Only in-filling should be required in Retford, building on the periphery of the town would result in sprawling development that the infrastructure (schools, employment, town centre etc.) cannot support. Retford does not require additional housing

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
942	5	Areas which already support employment, e.g. there are un-utilised areas within Ordsall and the north of the town has already become an area for employment development
942	6	The importance of open spaces should not be under estimated, they add to the character of a place and foster calmer environments for living (i.e. dissipate the tensions that can arise from dwellings being in too close proximity to one another or too many dwellings in one development)
942	7	Retford cannot support any significant growth for the reasons stated above. If it becomes much larger it will lose its character as a market town
942	8	Option B
942	9	It would make sense to link them to existing sites where appropriate facilities already exist
942	10	Separately, the needs of each are different
943	1	The criteria in the Screening Methodology is agreed.
943	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
943	3	It is not agreed that 13 new houses would be sufficient for a village of some 327 dwellings, located so close to Bawtry. Over the last 10 years or so, both public houses have closed due to lack of business, and whilst the local Post Office still remains, it only does so, whilst remaining on the open market.
943	4	Site 423 on the western fringe of the village is considered suitable since, it could be argued, it would not conflict with emerging National Planning Policy, would not cause overshadowing, create overlooking, or loss of privacy to the locality
943	5	with excellent visibility on Thorpe Lane create no adverse traffic issues.
943	6	Equally, development of this open grassland site, would not impact on land most valuable for agricultural purposes.
943	7	Part of the site remains at risk from the River Idle, and identified as being within Flood Zone 2, however, the majority of the site is suitable for development.
943	8	The site is bounded on the Thorpe Lane frontage by hedgerow, however, there are no trees on the site. The hedgerow would be retained along the frontage, severed only to accommodate new access to the site from Thorpe Lane.
943	9	It is anticipated that natural habitat will remain almost unaffected by a development of this site. A significant length of the site's north/north eastern boundary, bounds the River Idle, and the fact that whilst that part of the site which bounds the Idle, lies within Flood Zone 2, these factors virtually ensure the preservation of the natural habitat.
943	10	Should a limited development be permitted, whilst taking into consideration housing needs of the local community, the site would easily accommodate frontage development, reflecting that which currently prevails adjacent, on the Thorpe Lane frontage.
943	11	There are no Listed Buildings within this locality, which is also not within a Conservation Area, and as a result, development of this site, would therefore be compatible with existing neighbouring land use.
943	12	No.
943	13	It is considered that the open space identified on the Mattersey Village Map should be protected. The sites have remained as such, for many years, and therefore form a vital part of the village.
943	14	New Gypsy and Traveller sites should be concentrated in and around existing sites. Gypsies and travellers tend to cling to their natural habitat, so to speak, and where sites have existed for years, the sensible option has always been to extend those sites, if land space permits. That way, where local communities have always been aware, and accepted the presence of such sites, extension of same, as long as conditions permit, has not created too much concern.
943	15	Creation of new sites, always causes concern and conflict between local authorities, prospective residents, and local communities, and is rarely successful. Gypsies and travellers always prefer to mix with their own kind, or people of similar backgrounds, rather than be "parachuted" into areas where they do not feel welcome.
943	16	Transit and residential pitches, sited together, do not work. Two different cultures exist, whereby "transit people" are usually on the move, and "residential people" look to a more settled existence, putting their roots down and guiding their children through local schools. The two communities rarely mix.
943	17	Whilst unaware of potential sites, the response to Question 2 is particularly relevant.
943	18	The village is in need of a new lease of life, and it is considered an injection of at least 10% of the current number (327) of dwellings would revitalize the community.
944	1	Yes, the Screening Methodology criteria is acceptable.
944	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
944	3	The 4 house minimum allocation feedback appears inadequate. Sutton-cum-Lound provides a valuable and attractive contribution to the Bassetlaw region, and it's location so near to both Retford and Bawtry, makes it even more important. With travel distance short, it is easy to commute, and whilst not everyone wishes to reside in a town, a moderate increase in population can only be good for the village of Sutton.
944	4	With some 319 houses in the village, an increase of 10%, say 32 dwellings, would not adversely impact on the community, as long as they catered for appropriate current demand, and were built in the right positions. An increase in numbers, could only be good for the local economy, with the creation of a further shop a possible re-opening of a permanent Post Office, and inject life into what was always the hub of the village, the local public house!

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
944	5	Site 536 is chosen as probably the most suitable for development of some of those 32 dwellings. The Council's Final Assessment comment suggested as such, although it could be limited, due to highway restrictions relative to "the very narrow margin fronting the site and adjacent plot boundaries". However, it is pointed out that the owners of the site, who have considered development over a period of years, the intention always being to include their residence, Hawksley Farm house and outbuildings, to which site 536 is attached, as a development site. Combination of the two sites almost doubles the site frontage to Town Street, something which hadn't been envisaged by Planners when originally considered. As a result, the overall site could be serviced and accessed satisfactorily to Notts County Council's Highway requirements, enabling more houses to be built than the maximum of five off a private drive, referred to in Council documentation.
944	6	The site's favourable location within the built form of Sutton, makes it ideal for new development in the village. It is virtually surrounded by housing, the exception being the location of the Village Hall and Recreation Ground on the northern boundary.
944	7	It is therefore considered the site, through it's ideal location and attributes is more than ideal for development, and similarly, Site 275 could be considered for the balance of development suggested in a village increase of 32 dwellings, overall.
944	8	No
944	9	Every settlement needs areas of open space. Sutton is fortunate in that it is located in the middle of attractive countryside. Little, new, protected open space provision is proposed in the Assessment, maybe as a result, however, what little exists, ought to be protected.
944	10	Without doubt, Gypsy and Traveller sites should be concentrated in and around existing sites. Gypsies and travellers tend to cling to their natural habitat, so to speak,, and where sites have existed for years, the sensible option has always been to extend those sites, subject to land availability. In this way, where local communities have always been aware, and acceptable, of such sites, extension of same, as long as conditions permit, does not usually create too much of a problem.
944	11	However, whilst creation of new sites generally causes concern and conflict between local authorities, prospective residents, and local communities, and negotiations are rarely smooth. Gypsies and travellers generally prefer to mix with their own kind, or at least, people of similar backgrounds, rather than be "parachuted" into environments where they feel unwelcome and uncomfortable.
944	12	Transit and residential pitches, sited together, do not work. Two different cultures exist, "transit" people are frequently on the move, whereby "residential" people look to a more settled life, planting roots, schooling their children, and becoming part of the community. The two cultures do not mix easily.
944	13	Potential site locations are rare, however the above response to Question 121 is relevant.
945	1	The screening criterion do not appear to take into consideration the impact on 1) amenity impacts on existing residents / built environment, 2) the capacity of the local road network or 3) the potential impact on safety of the local community e.g. significant increase in traffic flows past schools. These aspects should be considered as a minimum as part of Criterion 7: Will the development detract from or enhance the existing built character of the settlement or neighbourhood?
945	2	No - development should be proportionate to growth
945	3	Sites 1, 52, 40, 41 and 364
945	4	10, 70, 71
945	5	Separate allocations as this will aide the development of communities in housing developments and provide accessible employment opportunities for all at other sites
945	6	Impact on existing population appears to have been omitted from considerations.
945	7	Yes
945	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
945	9	Concentrated around existing sites as facilities and assessment of impact on local communities are already in place.
946	1	Yes
946	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
946	3	Yes, we agree with the figure of 15 new houses in N Leverton
946	4	164 and 165 are the most appropriate sites for housing
946	5	Yes, the play park should be kept.
947	1	Yes I feel the town would benefit from further development, including affordable housing to help people get on the property ladder. By Developing the area we would see improvements in local school provision, more jobs in the area it can only be a positive move for the town.
947	2	207, 206,205, 359, 358 I have chosen these sites for development as they are currently an eye sore- I am appalled by the amount of rubbish that I have seen people dump on these derelict fields. It would be lovely to see them developed and put to a positive use for housing.
947	3	114,116 As these are already in an industrial area of the town hence keeping all the industry out of the centre of the town in one area.
947	4	I feel it would be best kept solely industrial
947	5	I feel that the Bircotes area of the town is already over developed, however the old Harworth village area has seen very little residential development in recent years and has a large number of plots available- I would buy a house there but I certainly would not buy one in Bircotes. However I do feel that Bircotes is missing a good public house as my friends all have to walk down to the blacksmiths arms for a drink, if the town is being developed give Bircotes a decent pub.- e.g. Weatherspoons

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
947	6	180, this field is next to the church- building on this would change the out look from the church- who wants to get married in a housing estate????
947	7	Parking at the church is horrendous any way if this space was developed it would only get worse- how would they accommodate funeral and wedding parking.
947	8	193- as I have always walked my dog down here- lovely to see the horses and cows grazing here.
947	9	Option B: Focused in just one of the above towns?
947	10	No- as we have enough metal thefts in the area already
947	11	Together- so they are in one area rather than spread out affecting more people
948	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
948	2	Yes, and some low cost housing for younger people
948	3	165 and 164 are most suitable, but sites near to main street do flood.
948	4	The village green and play area need to be protected.
949	1	I feel that site 35 is completely unsuitable for the following reasons. Lack of facilities (the estate has no doctors, community centre, dentist or other local amenities).
949	2	The local primary school is already over subscribed (I am a Governor).
949	3	Traffic out of the estate is already very busy in rush hour.
949	4	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
949	5	Open area (there is little 'play' area for existing kids).
950	1	Yes
950	2	No
950	3	4/W9 Option 4
950	4	198/W8
950	5	195/W8 The site is less intrusive on existing housing and has better access to main roads.
950	6	There is no woodlands to destroy when developing this site
950	7	Yes
950	8	No
950	9	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
950	10	Concentrated in and around existing sites if we have to have them at all.
950	11	Together with all the other traveller sites.
950	12	No.
951	1	Site 35 is unsuitable for development, the existing infrastructure struggles to cope at the moment.
951	2	Sites 9,30,38,45,90,151,218,371 and 561 offer the most potential.
951	3	W13
951	4	195/W8 in it's proposed form.
951	5	4/W8 option 1 appears best
951	6	Yes they should be protected.
951	7	Yes
951	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
951	9	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35. This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.
951	10	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
951	11	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
951	12	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
951	13	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
951	14	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
951	15	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
951	16	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
951	17	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
952	1	No.
952	2	Site 4 seems to be close to town with the ability to take housing and employment on 1 site rather than several
952	3	Yes
952	4	I would not recommend site 35 for development
952	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
952	6	Yes
952	7	Together to save on the provision of multiple facilities. i.e. shower/toilet blocks, sewerage and maintenance costs
952	8	NO
953	1	yes
953	2	yes
953	3	4 is the most suitable area
953	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extension of Town Boundary and Urban Sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on Site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
953	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of amenity for Children, Residents and Visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users. Development on this site would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
953	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including Wheat and Oilseed rape.
953	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to Shopping Facilities. Our local shops which are sited off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sited closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from Site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
953	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to Healthcare Provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with Doctors and Dentists being sited on the other side of town. Access on foot from Site 35 is impractical.
953	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of Utilities and Services. Development on Site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
953	10	4 - large area which is easy to develop and closer to local amenities such as shops, dentists
953	11	4 - large area which is close to an existing commercial development
953	12	yes
953	13	all my concerns regarding site 35 are in question 3
953	14	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
953	15	existing sites
953	16	together
953	17	no
953	18	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
953	19	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Responde nt	Comme nt	
953	20	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
953	21	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area.
953	22	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
953	23	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
953	24	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical.
953	25	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
954	1	No, I disagree with the categorisation in Criterion 4. Criterion 4 says that this assessment will consider all grade 3 sites as being of the same quality. The problem here is that you have automatically grouped them into 3&4, rather than grouping them into 1&2. I can see no good reason for doing this other than it conveniently makes planning permission easier to grant. I think any responsible person, if they take time to think about this, will agree it is a troubling, worrying and retrograde decision.
954	2	I think Worksop has seen huge population expansion in recent years. I believe Worksop has correct numbers of housing and employment opportunity - not higher than necessary. I therefore think no additional new development is required. In fact, additional development could quite possibly lead to excessive urban sprawl and the consummation of other smaller, neighbouring townships.
954	3	I strongly object to the proposal to build on site number 35 (Gateford). I am a local resident and know the catastrophic effect this would have locally. I have written a letter to the Worksop Policy & Conservation Manager Richard Schofield to discuss this in more detail.
954	4	I do not know about the local issues behind any of the other sites shown on the map so I am unable to comment on the suitability of any other site.
954	5	I do not know about the local issues behind any of the other sites shown on the map. However, it seems to me that sites W1 and W12 would be sensible locations for development of employment sites.
954	6	I do not know about the local issues behind any of the other sites shown on the map. It is not possible for me to make any comment here.
954	7	Building on site 35 would have a detrimental effect on this rich landscape, including interesting wildlife like bats, birds, badgers, squirrels and rabbits.
954	8	Also ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland.
954	9	The rich mosaic of habitats for animals and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable, building houses would have a detrimental effect on Owday woods, Whipman woods and Owday Plantation, which is a local site of importance for Nature Conservation. The area Gateford Hill Park includes Dog kennel Plantation, which is a 'mature landscaped area'.
954	10	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford road and stretching to Owday plantation, boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerows is important for our local wildlife and environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily, local and visiting recreational users. The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. I consider the whole of area 35 to be of the same importance as the protected Dog kennel Plantation.
954	11	I have written a letter to the Worksop Policy & Conservation Manager Richard Schofield to discuss this in more detail.
954	12	This land by the canal should be used to enhance recreational tourism in the area, this is an area of natural beauty enjoyed by many people for walking, cycling, sailing and fishing. It should be developed in a sensitive way accordingly.
954	13	Option B: Focused in just one of the above towns?
954	14	REMOVED
954	15	I am not aware of the local issues this question raises, so am unable to comment.
954	16	I am a resident of Gateford, and do not know of any site in Worksop that would be remotely suitable for this purpose.
955	1	We are writing to object to the proposed allocation of land for development north of Retford in the vicinity of Durham Grove, Palmer Road etc. ... We list our objections below in response to these plans
955	2	The lack of organised and effective notification to local people is a major concern. This in terms of both the plans themselves and also the ways in which further information can be obtained, particularly those who will be significantly effected by the proposals should they come about. The first official notification of the proposals which we received was a letter 17 January 2012 from John Mann MP, notifying us that objections should be raised in writing by 31 January 2012; just under two weeks to look at the proposals and submit objections. According to the documents there have been meetings held through the autumn and winter of 2011, yet we were unaware of these taking place. Formal consultation with local residents would appear in this instance to be minimal. Even though these are only proposals for development with no specific planning application in process consultation with local people must be of importance. Who is to develop the land, how are they to develop it and why they are to develop it all seem to be vague.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
955	3	We have lived in the vicinity of park lane for almost 40 years. We feel that a development of the extent proposed would significantly change the character of the established area of the town. The area is so large and enveloping of there stated existing residential streets that the character will be unavoidably changed by; increased traffic, increased mass of hard area, loss of green agricultural/rural land. In addition to this we also feel that the character of the town itself will be changed; will the feel of the historic market town, which is so important to the local economy still exist following this development?
955	4	Proposals are so vague in the details provided, yet proportionately the development area is enormous when compared with the existing residential area. In order to fully assess the impact of such development we believe that issues such as traffic, congestion, access, green space provision, road safety and local and local amenity provision have to be taken into account before even outline site allocation can be approved.
955	5	The area around Tiln Lane, particularly in the vicinity of Carr Hill School and also the junctions with Moorgate and Welham Road are already incredibly congested and road safety problems for the area.
955	6	Likewise, access from the other end of the proposed development area would raise road safety concerns on what is already a very fast and dangerous road leading out of Retford towards Welham and Claborough. Without firm outline of the proposed access we feel that this site allocation must not be allowed.
955	7	The land proposed for site allocation listed above is currently used as agricultural land. Those fields within this area that are proposed for development are those which are used for arable land; the areas that have been left out are those which flood on a regular basis. We would like to object to the current proposed areas not only on the basis of disappearance of good agricultural land ...
955	8	... but also on account of the impact on existing residential properties from the risk of flooding. The land where surface water flows at present will have disappeared under these plans. What will be the impact on existing residential areas such as park Lane if this area is built up. In addition, what will be the impact on the land that currently floods (and is not proposed for development); what studies have been carried out to reliably predict the movement of water following the changes to the environment?
955	9	As far as we are aware, these plans also sit outside of the current existing development envelope.
955	10	Our last objection has a wider view. Are these residence really required and where has the evidence for all this come from? The numbers proposed are vast and it is difficult to see where the need is considering the quantities of residential properties that have been constructed in recent years and the number of older properties that are on the market.
956	1	I noticed with great concerns the plans for more housing on Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road. I live on Denison Close and appreciate the need to building housing, although here it would cause problems if building takes place.
956	2	The land suggested (at the moment) soaks up run off from the hills behind. Areas nearby have suffered already from floods. Add to this the run off from roofs, drives and roadways and dwellings and obviously the drains could not cope. Residents would be up in arms.
956	3	The addition of more traffic in the area would be tremendously increased. At present cars queue up to enter London Road from Grove Coach Road especially at peak times when school traffic is around.
956	4	We have double parked 4x4s on our road - these are also bus routes.
956	5	In conclusion more houses means more traffic on the roads where we currently live, which are already congested. I therefore am not in favour of the proposed development.
957	1	I think that considering we are talking about allocation up to 2028 the number of dwellings allocated to each Rural Service Centre should be approx. that set out in Table 10.2 unless circumstances alter in the meantime.
957	2	I fully agree with this. The village needs to grow in a small way to continue to make it a sustainable community supporting school, shop, public house, churches etc. 12 is a sensible number
957	3	Though the school is almost full at the moment it is less than 10 years ago that closure was thought a possibility.
957	4	Whilst the old sewerage system is regarded as needing replacing, Severn Trent agree with this and will carry out improvements when funds allow.
957	5	Parts if sites 236, 237, 239 would be the most suitable as they are already accessible by roads and connected to the services.
957	6	239 would only be suitable up to the round side (i.e. Low Street and Westfield past the Sunn Inn), the rest of the area is very low lying and can flood.
957	7	238 floods badly.
957	8	464 has very limited access and would badly encroach on already developed areas.
957	9	Some consideration should be given to providing housing for the older population who wish to downsize but not leave the village.
957	10	As there is already some very small industrial development on Wood Lane, I suggest an area, somewhere, for minor environmentally friendly business development. This might be advantageous for local growth and employment.
957	11	I feel that 36/5 could be used for one/two dwellings. This is an old plaster pit which is in the care of the parish Council. It takes much time and funds to maintain and would make an excellent site for one or two houses
957	12	Areas 36/1 and 36/2 should be open for discussion with owners
957	13	Areas 36/3, 36/4, 36/6, 36/7 should be fully protected as the are the village recreational areas.
958	1	I agree with affordable housing in Elkesley, but not off Yew Tree Road
958	2	The drainage system needs updating. The housing already there is inadequate for the sewage system as every time it rains my garden is filled with sewage.
958	3	My views would still be the same as above as 11 houses would make a difference, so I'm sure 33 would.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
958	4	Site 248 as they don't seem to have a problem with sewage. Plus it isn't close to the primary school.
958	5	They need to get a bridge in place on the A1 before any building takes place, for extra flow of traffic.
959	1	I disagree. Currently over 76 houses have been committed to in the village. This is a large increase in the size of Gringley and we need to assess the impact of this increase over the next few years to determine the effect on the infrastructure of such an increase.
959	2	None - see answer to Q36.
959	3	We need to preserve the medieval street system and access to open spaces to keep the beauty and uniqueness of the village.
959	4	Yes - see answer to Q78
960	1	Strongly disagree. We, as a village, are already committed to over 70 new houses which represents a 25% increase in the size of Gringley.
960	2	None, see above
960	3	The village must be preserved with its open spaces which are rarely found.
960	4	Yes
961	1	We object! To sites for future housing developments.
962	1	I wish to give my views on the fact that the Kilton Forest Golf Course has been identified as a potential site for future development. This area has been given a site allocation number of 4. My feelings are that there should be no development of this area for housing or industrial use.
962	2	This whole area is one where if this land is developed there would be a loss of landscape where at the moment the area is depicting natural scenery. This is an extensive area of land regarded as being visually distinct.
962	3	Also, the area is the natural home of animal and plant life and obviously their ecological habitats would suffer if the development was to go ahead.
962	4	Automatically there would be a loss of trees and hedgerows which would be to the detriment of wildlife.
962	5	At the moment, this area provides a visual public amenity and the whole area is pleasant and agreeable. It would be decimated if the proposed development went ahead. What looks to be proposed would mean a density and mass of buildings that would greatly alter the appearance of the whole area.
962	6	The Kilton Forest Golf Course provides a much needed facility for the area that is easily accessible to the local people. The golf course is now well established and has had a large amount of investment put into it. If the golf course as we know it was taken away, what message would this be sending out to the people of Worksop who can ill afford the charges of private golf courses. We should be looking to extend amenities of the area, not the opposite.
962	7	This area has included in it several football fields set out within it and a grass bowls area which would also be lost. It is also used by the rambling association, off road cyclists and joggers. Green space in the area is already being taken up and so is at a premium, for example at the Clinton Maltkins site.
962	8	In Worksop we have a very limited amount of green space on this side of the town and once taken up will be lost forever. A price cannot be put on this open space. For the wellbeing of the people of Worksop it should be left untouched.#
963	1	I agree we need more housing in Retford but only if you can reduce the dreadful unemployment in this area. Easy in/out tenancy agreements for new businesses together with low rates and rent are needed.
963	2	I consider the best place for new housing to be site nos. 1, 40, 41 and 364.
963	3	If 577 new houses are to be built, we need a new school
963	4	and good roads in and out of the area. Ordsall is good for access into and out of Retford, also being near to the A1 and the M1 for people who travel to work using these routes. There is room for a new school and it would sense to have all the new houses and the new school in the same area so that the children do not have to go far to school.
963	5	Plot 259 and R2 might be suitable for a new school, doctors surgery and a few local shops which would bring employment possibilities for new housing.
963	6	The town centre is dying and the Council should consider free parking incentives for new shops to move in to the area.
964	1	I am a pensioner and would like to be able to stay in the village with family close by. I would like to live in a flat with others of a similar age group for company.
964	2	I go to the shop for things I need and the bus to Retford.
965	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
965	2	Enough land should be allocated for up to 30 houses to be built in the next couple of years and the rest of the allocated land be built on yearly.
965	3	Allocated block to be utilised first is 281 and 275. Following years, 276 and 452.
965	4	The village envelope to remain as it is.
965	5	The village needs starter homes to enable the next generation to be able to afford to purchase houses.
965	6	There is a shop and local pub which will benefit from growth, this will also ensure a good bus service is sustained, population growth will also raise opportunities to improve transport services.
965	7	Different age groups will also help with families supporting each other.
965	8	There are many thriving groups and clubs in the village which will also benefit from growth.
965	9	I did attend the planning meeting and found it very useful to hear and share views with the local village people.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
965	10	Gypsy/Traveller sites should be concentrated together at existing sites as they are based in family groups and seem settled.
966	1	Considering the final SHLAA map of Beckingham I do not support any new site allocation within the actual village itself. Maybe conservation status should be considered for Low Street, parts of High Street and Bar Road north. This would help with more careful consideration for future planning.
966	2	If necessary, site 101 could maybe be considered for development to improve an industrial site, now mainly unused it seems.
966	3	I may be cynical but I believe the whole idea for a pub on either site 102 or site 106 was a complete red herring! Pubs are closing at an alarming rate per week at the moment. This was just a means of gaining planning permission for houses on the two sites and as they are outside the original village envelope the plans breached this (so did the plans for the pub). I do not understand the ideas of the Parish Council on this matter.
966	4	To further protect the density of the village I would like to ask for sites 203 and 105 to have protected status and thus avoid any future development plans.
966	5	If the allocation of five houses, already approved next to the village green, could be social housing this would be extremely beneficial for the village school and for people born in the village who wish to stay.
966	6	Any proposal for G&T site could be looked at with regard to the field next to the Trent Port pub which the Travellers often use for their horses and garden rubbish
966	7	We have many houses and bungalows for sale in the village at the present time, many being on the market for many months. I do feel we have enough dwellings for the foreseeable future without further large scale development being necessary.
967	1	I believe that in order to maintain provision of sufficient housing for the development of our community, it is essential to allow for approximately 70 dwellings. This amounts to a mere 5 per year over the duration of this plan. This will allow younger people in the village, growing to marriageable age, to settle and raise their families as their parents before them, in Blyth. I am talking low cost housing, not mansions. One or two bedroom bungalows or flats, but preferably something that will fit in with the existing dwellings, like semi-detached or town houses. If these were available it would also precipitate movement in other age groups, allowing elderly people in large properties to downsize and make their properties available to older, more established families that need the space. This frees the smaller properties and enables the cycle to keep moving. This will help sustain our shop, post office, school and at least some of our local public houses.
967	2	I strongly advocate sites 266, 369, 589 and 590. In doing so, I declare an interest as I am the owner of one of the sites. This interest has also been declared to the Parish Council, of which I am a member. These are sites that would allow small developments on a gradual basis, rather than full blown estates springing up all at once. The development could be need driven over the duration of the plan. If only 30 or 40 dwellings are identified as being needed, then that's all that should be built, but to allow for 70 will give a comfortable and sensible provision.
967	3	It is important to bear in mind that the current central government are keen advocates of promoting sustainable rural living and allowing rural development is one of their tenets.
967	4	I completely agree that the open spaces identified on your map should be protected from development.
968	1	No to any more houses until we have better drains, roads and the bridge is built
968	2	No, because the infrastructure is not able to cope.
968	3	None until the biomass has stopped
968	4	Safety in the village - too many cars, lorries, buses on roads that built for the war. Road safety concerns.
969	1	Changes I would suggest to the screening methodology criteria are: - existing vacant and derelict land and buildings should be considered
969	2	On Portland Place one home has remained derelict or uninhabited for over 10 years. On Low Lound Road, buildings have been left to the elements and are derelict. Under used garage blocks should be assessed and considered for redevelopment.
969	3	Account should be taken of new homes built on Church Way and conversions on Low Lound Road. These have provided at least 6 new dwellings. One house nears completion on Portland Place.
969	4	The screening should have taken into account the needs of Sutton community. There is low demand for houses in rural locations with limited services. You need a car to live in Sutton which makes it unattractive to new starters.
969	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
969	6	Enough land should be allocated for 3 new houses as one is near completion.
969	7	Small infill at sites 281, 282 and 274. One house on each site would have a small environmental loading
969	8	Parking and access is a problem in Sutton. Due to its rural location, households poses up to 3 cars. Adequate size gardens and driveways should be planned to provide off road parking.
969	9	I agree sites 47/1 and 47/2
969	10	The village green should also be protected for future generations to enjoy.
969	11	G&T sites should be concentrated around existing sites and not new locations
969	12	Transit and residential pitches should be provided together to assist in the security of these sites.
969	13	No locations I can think of, offer the services that people require.
970	1	There is no requirement or demand for allocation of sites for a further eight houses in Gringley, over and above what is being built at the former detention centre (DC) site.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
970	2	The introduction of the SAI&O document states that the amount of new development that could be allocated to the sites in the document far exceeds that required in Bassetlaw to 2025. Already some 60+ new houses are planned at the former DC site. This is a development of significant size compared to the size of the village. No other Rural Service Centre villages have proposed new development of similar proportions. This development will provide a major share of the Rural Service Centre housing requirements in the plan and further developments in Gringley are not required.
970	3	The effect of the DC site on Gringley is yet to be understood. It will be a densely populated site which will strain the existing village services, cause a major increase in traffic in the village streets and a build-up of traffic on entering and leaving the bypass. Further developments in the centre of the village would make this situation worse.
970	4	Gringley is already subject to major change as a result of the DC site. According to the BDC map another four sites are already committed for new housing. There is no justification for further development of sites 134 and 135.
970	5	Overall, Gringley has already provided a disproportionate level of new housing development for Bassetlaw at the DC site. No more housing is required or justified.
970	6	There is no justification for further development of sites 134 and 135 for the reasons discussed above.
970	7	The key facts/findings of the BDC SA I&O para. 10.11 states that if development were to take place, small extensions to the village would be preferred to large extensions or infilling between the development boundary lines. However, sites 134 and 135 both constitute major infilling.
970	8	Both proposed new sites are within the original medieval street structure and are within the conservation area. Developing these sites and providing access would have a deleterious effect on these features.
970	9	Gringley has suffered from flooding in the past, particularly on Low Street. Proposed site 135 would adjoin Low Street, where there are no mains surface drains and further development would increase the risk of flooding.
970	10	The two proposed new sites occupy part of the finger of countryside extending into the centre of the village, highly regarded as countryside by occupiers of surrounding properties and other villagers. Development of the sites would be deleterious to this important feature.
970	11	The village character of Gringley is based on the existing street system, with a unique situation of pastures, smallholdings and orchards within the village and with continuous connection to the countryside. Development of the two sites would absorb a large proportion of these aspects and would seriously damage the village character, with a loss of green space and associated ecology.
970	12	Low Street is a narrow lane with grass verges and banks topped by low walls or hedges. The Gringley Parish Plan states that these features are an integral part of the village character. The character in Low Street would be destroyed by development of site 135.
970	13	Open spaces within the village are characteristics of Gringley. The open spaces on the map should continue to be protected from future development proposals. Other open space within the conservation area should be protected.
970	14	New sites should be concentrated around existing sites.
970	15	It would be logical to provide transit and residential pitches together for provision of services.
970	16	The character and structure of Gringley benefit from open spaces between and around the houses and farms. A finger of countryside extends into the centre of the village and is highly regarded as a landscape feature by occupiers of surrounding properties and other villagers. The proposed site occupies a significant part of the western end of this feature. Development of the site would be undesirable and would set a precedent for further incursions into this open land.
970	17	The proposed development site adjoins and would lead from Low Street, which is a narrow lane, with no footpaths. Access from the west is via a blind bend with an existing junction at the bottom of Cross Hill with Laycock Avenue. Village traffic and agricultural vehicles use this route for access to Middlebridge Road and the east side of the village, including the Playing Field. This traffic will increase as a result of the former DC site development. Further traffic arising from access to the proposed new site by residents and service providers would be undesirable.
970	18	The proposed development site is within the newly-defined Conservation Area. New housing on this site would be incongruous and intrusive.
970	19	The proposed development includes provision for open space and public gardens. This would not be in-keeping with this part of the village and is not required. Site maintenance to a good standard would be a cost to the village and may not always be achieved.
970	20	The proposed site is well-overlooked and the development plan suggested would adversely affect the amenity of adjacent properties through noise, disturbance and lack of privacy.
970	21	The proposed development site includes an area which is not to be developed. This offers little to overcome the effects of the proposals on the village character and the amenity of surrounding properties.
971	1	I am writing to express my objection to the proposal for future housing developments in Retford. The proposed sites I specifically wish to object to are sites 7, 46 and 309
971	2	My first objection is to the sheer scale of the development. It is proposed that these sites would create approximately 900 new homes. This would undoubtedly have a great impact and create an enormous reduction in quality of life for existing residents.
971	3	New development would completely dominate the area and be completely out of character with the existing properties
971	4	as well as leading to increased noise levels, disturbance and loss of privacy for residents

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
971	5	A result of any future development would result in traffic generation that would occur will put existing and future residents' safety at risk. Combine sites 46, 309 and 7 with 33, 533, 512, 37 and 69 and the result would be an enormous increase in traffic in the area. Where the road infrastructure is not sufficient for current traffic levels, especially the junction of Moorgate/Tiln lane and around Carr Hill School, so surely any increase in traffic generation would have a dramatic effect on road safety.
971	6	Due to the heavy clay content of the soil, I have concerns that any development would effect the drainage of the surrounding land. I feel that any reduction drainage would create increased surface runoff during heavy rain and result in increased flooding. Also, future development would put a huge strain on the existing sewer system.
971	7	Further concerns of mine regarding future development would result in the loss of important open space. This has always been agricultural land and any development would not only harm the landscape value of the area
971	8	But would also destroy valuable habitat, which is home to a diverse range of wildlife including rabbits, hares, pheasants, and in the ponds in sites 46 and 309 - Newts.
971	9	In conclusion I object to the proposal for developments on sites 46, 309 and 7 on the grounds that any development would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, resulting in a loss of amenities, aggravating safety and traffic problems, resulting in unacceptable living conditions for new and existing residents, as well as destroying a valuable natural environment. All of which are contrary to the policies of BDC Local Plan
972	1	No. I disagree. The main drains have problems coping as it is and there are empty properties in the village as it is.
972	2	Site 251
972	3	I live at the White House on Main Road, opposite site 252. The entrance to this proposed site is situated on the bend. We have serious problems as it is now because of visibility, getting off the drive. The last thing we need is more activity which would make it even more dangerous. We have lived here for 11 years and there have been seven accidents on this bend.
972	4	REMOVED
973	1	We are very concerned about the development in the Tiln Lane, Palmer Road area. Our main concern is that there will be a lot greater traffic generation on Tiln Lane which is already dangerous because of all the HGVs that are diverted on to it to avoid the Low Bridge at Welham. All this extra traffic will only add to the already dangerous condition.
973	2	All this traffic has to pass Carr Hill School which is already dangerously congested at school arrival and leaving times. There was a child killed on this road a year or two ago so to put even more traffic on this road would be criminal.
973	3	Our next concern is extra demand on an already overworked sewerage system in the area.
973	4	There is also some localised flooding because of inadequate top water drainage.
974	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
974	2	Need more than 4 houses
974	3	Block 281, 275 and 276
974	4	We need affordable housing. My children would like to settle here, this would also keep the family together.
974	5	We have a thriving community and with growth this will allow things to continue to improve, transport, clubs, shop and pub.
975	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
975	2	Any
975	3	No
975	4	Yes
975	5	Daneshill is large enough, not full.
975	6	No idea
975	7	Comment: I am 85 years old and this is a complete waste of tax payers money. I cannot cope with all this paperwork!
976	1	Would someone explain what is meant by 'opportunity'? It conveys a meaning of being favourable, but how? How does it 'warrant consideration for future use'? It is all very vague. Please explain. At present the main drainage ditch on Blackstope Lane is kept clear by a local resident (retired) otherwise it would just get bunged up, like it did prior to the flood. Prior to the flood someone proposed a crackpot scheme to build several properties in place of the industrial buildings, the ditch was to be enclosed so sewage could be pumped into it, and yet some council department must have given thought to reach the stage of a presentation in the Town Hall. Fortunately the public rejected it, the flood certainly did. Does 'warrant consideration' mean another crackpot scheme? Unless of course someone is prepared to spend several millions on a proper drainage scheme.
976	2	Does the very fact that gypsies, travellers and travelling show people are the subject on the next page have any meaning for future consideration? We certainly hope not. We have already suffered the trauma and stress of a flood and have to live with the consequences.
976	3	It's time we had good news for the future. No more buildings, no more concrete and no to gypsies, travellers and travelling show people.
977	1	The present road infrastructure is unsuitable for such a development
977	2	More traffic congestion including the problem of the low bridge situated at Welham causing heavy traffic to use the local area leading to Hayton Smeath which is little more than a single track road.
977	3	Brownfield sites should be developed first before using good agricultural land, surely there are other sites in town that will not affect agricultural land and green site areas. Once the countryside is lost to building it can never be regained!

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
977	4	Development will alter the character of the area. The countryside is a very important part of people's lives and the environment.
977	5	Will be losing beautiful vistas over swathes of extremely pretty countryside which once built on can never be retrieved.
977	6	Loss of thick hedges and trees which are habitat to many species of birds and wildlife
977	7	The land is prone to flooding after heavy rain
977	8	The loss of privacy to many residents which will lead to much unhappiness and resentment in the area
977	9	We feel that brown sites should be used first and foremost and then areas that are not going to affect peoples lives too much e.g. plot 512 on Tiln Lane, plot 6, plot 489, plot 488, plot 364 and brown site areas 51 and R7 and 364 and if need be part of No.7. This would avoid too many buildings in one particular area and would not affect peoples lives too much, after all you need happy residents!
977	10	We hope that you take everyone's views on board and realise what Retford will be losing if these sites are used for building and increasing the population by many thousands of people, after all we are only a small market town with very restricted services and that is the way we all wish to stay.
978	1	I agree with all criteria
978	2	Except criterion 6, because development in a 'conserve' area should not be considered as detrimental if it enhances the area. therefore a site scoring 'green' at criterion 7 should not be penalised simply for being in a 'conserve' area.
978	3	No comment
978	4	I believe it would be wrong to allow the residents questionnaire to be the sole factor when taking into consideration when deciding how much housing land is to allocate. My reasons for saying this are: i) the residents questionnaire is based upon feedback from a small percentage of residents
978	5	ii) It is not a terribly robust way of assessing housing requirements.
978	6	iii) If sites for 11 properties are allocated there is no guarantee that all 11 houses will be built, so is there not an argument for over allocating? This would also create a level of competition between sites which would prevent escalation of plot prices and aid the development of more affordable housing.
978	7	iv) surely local demand should be the only factor to be considered? Would it not make more sense to consider how East Markham could be enhanced by new development through improvement to the aesthetics of the village or improvements to local facilities.
978	8	The sites which I believe could benefit from redevelopment are 110 (portal span/concrete barns behind Rose Dene Farm)
978	9	141 (portal span, concrete barn behind Woodward Farm) and
978	10	145 (commercial building amongst residential properties on east side of Beckland hill)
978	11	I would favour allocation of circa 20 dwellings across these three sites.
978	12	The above sites are in line with the residents survey feedback which advocates small extensions to the village (which sites 110 and 141 would be). The survey feedback also calls for re-use of brownfield sites, which in practical – as opposed to planning – terms, all three sites are. All three not only have existing buildings on them, but are also to varying degrees, eyesores.
978	13	No comment
978	14	The open spaces identified for East Markham seem to make perfect sense. I would agree that they should be protected.
978	15	Probably concentrated around existing sites, although the numbers of pitches currently vacant suggests there may not be demand for additional spaces.
979	1	See East Markham Questionnaire
980	1	No. There are more than enough with the 60+ being built on the Detention Centre Site. The Infrastructure of the village will not support these, let alone anymore.
980	2	None
980	3	As above at 76. Lack of facilities and amenities
980	4	All of it in the conservation area
981	1	Sites 537 and 157 are not ideally situated over the railway line from the point of view of easy access. Where the land has previously been quarried the possibility of flooding also exists. These plots are Agricultural land, and are growing crops which are much needed by the Nation, as a whole. The farming industry generates both income and employment for local people and should not be lost to housing.
981	2	Sites 516 and 156 are closer to the local school and community and could be more suitable especially for families with children for the minimum of 14 houses required by 2015 / 2016.
981	3	Sites 234 and 224 are productive agricultural land, even Grade 3 land should be retained for growing crops. There is a growing demand for food and such fields are vital for future needs. The sites have also suffered from subsidence, as has the North Road, in that area.
981	4	Whichever growth would provide a better spread from the point of view of access and have sufficient infrastructure. Not in a green belt or using agricultural land.
981	5	Ranskill Village does not have the facilities to cope with any more than the 14 houses required. (See : Response to Question 1, Sites: 516 and 156) . Even another 14 properties will create extra Traffic. Despite the speed limits being in place, they are often exceeded and Road Safety becomes an issue. Also the Village lacks Parking space especially near the Shops/Post Office
981	6	Only the sites previously suggested at 156 and 516
981	7	Not at the moment
981	8	All Green sites should be protected, especially Agricultural land.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
981	9	Sites should be concentrated not scattered within the District. One good site, Council maintained and well known to the Travellers would be better for the Gypsy Travellers and easier for the Council.
981	10	Keep the sites together, because both Gypsies and or Travellers may be members of larger family groups who like to meet up from time to time.
981	11	I do not know of any such land as of now.
981	12	Farmland, in particular, needs protection from building and developments in our country as a whole. Once it is taken for such processes, there is no turning back and the land which has been made arable to provide food, fodder and even as a fuel source, is gone forever.
982	1	Yes
982	2	Option A
982	3	Yes, I agree there should be at least 15 houses
982	4	The best sites for development would be 164/165
982	5	Main Street floods
982	6	Yes. This should be protected
982	7	Existing plot
982	8	Separately
982	9	None
983	1	Yes
983	2	Option A
983	3	Yes I agree there should be at least 11 houses
983	4	462/456
983	5	None
983	6	Protected
983	7	Existing plot
983	8	Separately
983	9	None
984	1	Two, and the houses should be allocated to the young residents in Blyth
984	2	178
984	3	There is a big traffic problem in Blyth
984	4	All open spaces in Blyth should be protected and no gypsy or traveller pitches
985	1	Two, and the houses should be allocated to the young residents in Blyth
985	2	178
985	3	There is a big traffic problem in Blyth
985	4	All open spaces in Blyth should be protected and no gypsy or traveller pitches
986	1	The issue concerning site 512, 37, 533, 7, 46, 309 is the one of Tiln Lane which is currently used as a HGV alternate route to avoid the low bridge at Welham (height restriction). This road (Tiln Lane) crosses the Chesterfield Canal at Clarborough. It is a narrow single track bridge, which will require widening along with the rest of the road. A relief road will have to be laid down from Tiln Lane to site no. 7, 46 and 309 simply to handle construction traffic. There are safety issues regarding traffic movements to and from site no. 7 and 46/309 using Bigsby Road. The infrastructure around these sites will have to be improved greatly.
986	2	Site no. 7 has problems – wet meadows and a water table that means there is a constant run-off into the chesterfield canal. Potential drainage issues.
986	3	Summary. Safety for school children in Tiln Lane.
986	4	Sewerage/ drainage problems
986	5	Current HGV traffic which will increase
986	6	Significant infrastructure costs
987	1	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site no. 35 (near Gateford Hill Nursing Home). This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations. In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons:
987	2	a) A great loss of amenity. This is a tremendously rich landscape of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland, open walkways and bridleways which residents and visitors thoroughly enjoy. The building would have a detrimental effect on existing residents and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment.
987	3	b) Urban Sprawl and extension of the town boundary. The development of site 35 will extend beyond the existing Worksop town boundary and encroach on walling wells and Carlton in Lindrick. This area has sufficient housing and additional housing will lead to far too much density.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
987	4	c) A loss of nature conservation. There will be a catastrophic effect on Owday and Whipman woods and Owday Plantation. There are Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation.
987	5	d) Safety issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families, friends and dogs for recreational walks.
987	6	e) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and well used by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. There will also be extra noise and pollution from increased traffic.
987	7	f) Infrastructure and services. There is inadequate infrastructure to support the development e.g. insufficient doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Gas, electricity, water and sewage will have to be provided – more destruction of the environment.
987	8	g) Loss of agriculture and employment. At present this land is agricultural and productive supporting the employment of land workers.
987	9	h) Finally, these buildings will spoil our privacy and spoil our outlook by overlooking our property.
987	10	I am deeply distressed at the proposed development of site 35 and hope someone on the council will hear the heartfelt pleas of so many people who love that area.
988	1	The town should give more priority to the extension of employment allocation above the ideals of the extra housing, ideally giving a minimum allocation of having a local catchment area.
988	2	The area's most suitable for housing would be the 182, 187, 191 areas.
988	3	The area's most suitable for future development would ideally be the R4, R6 areas so that all developments would be in the same place.
988	4	This area should be developed as a mixed leisure and employment area, so it can provide extended facilities to the community that is established, as well as the people who will move into the area.
988	5	The existing sites should be extended, and not spread into new areas, as the facilities to provide for the travellers is already in place.
988	6	The transit and residential areas should be kept separate, so that site allocation, facilities policing and management would be easier to enforce.
988	7	I do not know of any areas in this location that would be acceptable for development.
989	1	We need employment growth specifically for people already living here before more housing bringing more people
989	2	191
989	3	No preference
989	4	No preference
989	5	The number of people employed in the village who do not live in the village. Any potential of businesses coming in should have a mandate to employ at least 50% local
989	6	REMOVED
989	7	REMOVED
989	8	REMOVED
990	1	No the numbers look realistic.
990	2	Preferred sites housing in order 35, 8, 30, 90, 9
990	3	Preferred employment sites W1,W12, W13
990	4	Mixed use sites 26, W6, 195, 343, W8
990	5	The existing open spaces should be protected. Some more space should be included in any new housing spaces
990	6	Yes expand existing sites for Gypsies and Travellers
990	7	Both transit and residential together
991	1	I refer to our telephone conversation and as part of the consultation process on the Issues & options stage of the Local Development Framework process, I wish to record our clients owning BAS0041 are talking to and have no objection to co-operating with, other land owners in the future.
991	2	The above site remains available and the landowner is happy for the land to be promoted for both housing and a mixed used housing and employment scheme, if required.
992	1	We have no village hall, just the excellent Memorial Hall, we do have a dentist
992	2	Agree 9 new houses
992	3	No preference
992	4	Yes
993	1	We need some starter homes building on block 281 so that the population is all ages which allows families to support each other, this also keeps families going and improving.
993	2	Block 281 has a very good access and would also benefit the village with terraced starter homes.
994	1	No – Blyth traffic, school is busy enough. Major roads would have to be addressed. No houses!
994	2	Neither / N/A
994	3	N/A
994	4	No – No future development
994	5	Existing sites – no new sites

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
994	6	If at all together but at existing sites
994	7	I do not know of any land
995	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
995	2	18/30 houses could be built
995	3	Site no. 480 should be developed
995	4	Site no. 480 should be used for mixed used site
995	5	Other potential housing sites should not be used as it is greenfield land and would extend the village boundary
995	6	Open spaces should be protected from development.
995	7	Concentrated in and around existing sites to keep them in the one area being used now
995	8	Transit and residential pitches should be provided together to keep then all in one spot
996	1	I write to you as a relative of an elderly resident of Park Lane, Retford having read to my horror about the housing proposals being debated for that area. My grandmother, who is aged 90, and who has lived very happily on Park Lane for almost 30 years, is devastated that her beautiful surroundings are potentially going to change significantly. I too, am saddened to think that such lovely countryside is possibly going to be turned into a concrete jungle and impact so very negativity on that community.
996	2	My grandmother and our family are not urbanites, we were farmers who came from nearby villages and so when she moved there in the late 80's it was like home from home - bang smack in the countryside but with the added benefit of nearby amenities. We often walk down the garden with her towards the fields to admire the horses, hear the many birds sing and spot the odd heron in the long grass. That destruction alone for the wildlife will be horrendous in itself. The peace and tranquillity is striking and gives the residents, often the older generation, such a great quality of life. The area around Park Lane is renowned for its exclusivity and that is exactly how it should stay.
996	3	I visit Retford at least once a week and note that the increase in traffic around the Spiral Hill area is growing year on year. Let's put a stop to this now and leave this area alone and unspoilt.
996	4	I know that there will naturally be a lot of opposition to these housing proposals and my grandmother hopes that her wishes, along with those of her neighbours, will be considered very seriously by all concerned. Let's keep this part of the Retford open countryside protected for other generations to enjoy rather than cramming in as many properties into a space which really should never be even short-listed for such plans.
997	1	In 2007 several properties suffered serious flood damage, which not only affected the area surrounding Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road, but also caused severe damage to properties on Grove Street, Blackstope Lane, Clatters Close and Welham Grove. In short, the whole of the Eastern Boundary of Retford. All of these areas have to cope with the natural and at times excessive drainage from the high ground at Grove Woods, Grove Hills and Leverton hills. The proposed development land would destroy the already inadequate flood plain which currently offers some protection to properties on the towns eastern border. The present infrastructure is not adequate to support any future housing developments.
997	2	Bracken Lane school serving the area is almost full to capacity, Its sports field is water logged many months of the year. Parking of cars whilst parents drop off children is already a major problem with cars blocking pavements and roads at peak times and is an accident waiting to happen.
997	3	Currently there is a major problem attempting to access onto London Road via Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane due to existing traffic volumes. The developments would only worsen this situation and cause a greater potential for accidents.
997	4	We are unclear as to the improvements any developer would make to access the sites. It is possible that vehicles could use Cavendish Road, Rutland Road, Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road as a Rat Run from Grove Road when the crossing is closed.
997	5	The above objections have been raised on other occasions when individuals have sought to gain planning consent for some of the sites currently under consideration. We sincerely hope that our serious concerns and objections will result in a total rejection of any planning approval for these sites.
998	1	When I bought my property, I was advised that this area, which was a field with crops, was a green field site and that it would never be built on. Where I live at the moment is a nice quiet cul-de-sac, where it has always been a good area to bring up children and enjoy quiet evenings in the garden.
998	2	Should this road tum into a thoroughfare, the potential traffic would make it hazardous for young children and the noise would be intolerable for residents.
998	3	As we live directly next to the children's play area and the golf course, this development will have a major impact on our lives. We would be changing from a property next to the countryside, into a property in the middle of a housing estate.
998	4	REMOVED
998	5	The Kilton Forest golf course, also gives much pleasure to many people, for as a municipal course, makes it possible for people to enjoy their chosen sport, as playing at other establishes courses are exorbitantly expensive. Although I am not a player, I still get pleasure for watching others enjoy their pursuits.
998	6	So, I really believe that this development would considerable reduce my quality of life.
998	7	Care also needs to be taken around the ponds as the contain Great Crested Newts, which are a protected Species
999	1	On going flooding problems in the area. In 2007 several properties suffered serious flooding.
999	2	The present infrastructure is not adequate to cope with future developments.
999	3	Bracken Lane school serving this area has roads which are almost full to capacity and its Sports field is water logged many months of the year.
999	4	The roads will not accept more vehicles at peak times.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1000	1	In that context, I would wish to comment on some of the sites identified for potential development over the next 15 years. A clear statement within the core strategy for Retford is that "residential development proposals will be supported within the development boundary" (P28 Policy CS3 Retford). I would therefore question why a number of sites identified for potential development are outside of the current development boundary. The sites local to me (sites refs. 3,370,511,488,489) are all sites located outside of the current development boundary where development would disturb lovely views into the countryside.
1000	2	In this context I note that site ref 3 is currently predominantly part of a conservation area, adding particular weight to the desire to avoid development on this site.
1000	3	The countryside surrounding Retford is a valuable asset and key to the quality of life for all those living in the Town and particularly for those in living close proximity to the development boundary, where decisions to buy property have been specifically made with this boundary in mind (mine included). Whilst accepting that there is a need to develop further housing in our area this should be within the development boundary that already exists. I would be very disappointed if valuable countryside was to be lost unnecessarily, with priority given to developer's profit.
1000	4	The implication of the council's own strategy is that the target for new housing can be achieved without building outside of the current development boundary. I would strongly endorse this strategy and hope it will not be weakened through allocating sites for housing outside this boundary in the foreseeable future.
1001	1	The roads would not be suitable for taking additional traffic. Access to London Road is already problematic especially during school run times.
1001	2	Current schooling facilities would be inadequate.
1001	3	Flooding and drainage would be a concern.
1001	4	The location of our home is significant in terms of the peace and tranquillity it gives. The views to the rear of our property are magnificent so to obscure these views would undermine the value of the property.
1001	5	I (C.E.M. Ford) have a serious health condition which could be adversely affected by the disruption of possible building work.
1002	1	The Development is not appropriate to a Conservation Area. The proposal to build a new estate of houses in the heart of the conservation village, would be against the principle reasons for establishing the Conservation area in the first place. If the development is compared against the original reasons for granting Conservation status it will be seen to be at odds on all accounts.
1002	2	The Development is not consistent with the Planning Policy. The Councils plans do not show this area as designated for planning. I understand that it is the Councils plan to limit any planning in villages and to give preference to area such as Retford, Misterton, Worksop etc. If this is not the case maybe you could give us further guidance on the Councils policy.
1002	3	This land has been refused permission several times in the past. The reasoning behind the objections we cannot see have changed. If they have maybe it could be explained why the Councils stated reasons for not granting permission were incorrect or unfounded. We are not aware of any change of Planning policy that would warrant such a change of reasoning.
1002	4	There is not a need for more Public Open Space/Gardens in the village. The Village is not in any need of any new areas of Public Open Space/Gardens for the following reasons: The Village has better things to do with its limited money than support another area requiring upkeep. The land is on a gradient that would render it as unusable. The width of the access rd shown is not shown as wide enough. It is shown as 3.5m and would need to be 5m plus a footpath. The necessary longitudinal gradient would be such that the access rd would be in a cutting 4m deep, which would leave precious little land left. Any open space on Low street would only add to the reported problem of areas where youths congregate, leading to problems with litter, intimidation, graffiti etc. Another open space would add to Low street being used as a Convenience for Dogs.
1002	5	There is no demonstrable need for such a Development in the village. The Village is in no need of any additional housing and in particular of "high quality houses." If there is any need it would be for bungalows for the over 60's. This would free up larger houses for families and allow the aging population to remain in Gringley. However this location would be inappropriate due to the gradients and distance from public transport. Existing houses on Low Street have remained on the market for well in excess of 18months, supporting the lack of demand/need for more "high quality houses." There is already under development a large estate in the village that must more than meet any need for Quality houses in Gringley. We understand that these have not been selling well.
1002	6	The Infrastructure would not support this Development. The proposed Development would double the number of houses on Low Street. Low Street retains many of the characteristics and features that were "sighted" as being of significance in granting the status of a Conservation area. However a consequence of this is that the roads are not of sufficient width and strength to support the movements of the existing traffic. Indeed it is often necessary to reverse back up the street if anything larger than a small car is encountered coming in the opposite direction. The road is blocked when Oil tankers, delivery vans, farm vehicles etc. are encountered. The sight lines from any of the existing properties do not meet the highway authority guidelines. Any new access would need to meet these and would prove to be impossible in this location without considerable earthworks that would be completely at odds with the Village Conservation Values.
1002	7	The development would be on totally none porous clay with a high plasticity. This would render such a site as totally unsuitable for soak-always. Any attenuation storage of water would require an area greater than the development site itself. The amount of disposal of surplus soil from this compounded with that from the access "cutting" and the deep foundations required for the houses, being founded on high plasticity clay, would result in thousands of tonnes of soil being transported through the narrow weak lanes and up a 1 in 4 hill and through the heart of the village which by its very nature has historic houses with weak foundation. The quantity of surplus soil generated from the existing development would demonstrate the size of this problem. They did not at least have to transport this through the village and were able to use a large sweeper. A sweeper would not be able to negotiate Cross hill and Low street and would at best leave a slippery surface on the road. On such a site any surface water would undoubtedly run off down Low Street, which already floods at least once a year, and has on more than one occasion resulted in the road being closed due to the drains bursting and lifting the asphalt surface and the drain covers.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1002	8	It is highly unlikely that the foul sewers in low street have the capacity to take any further load, although I do not have the details to support this.
1003	1	As a resident of Rose Bank on Low Street, two doors down from the proposed development site, I feel that with Low Street effectively being a single road highway where two cars cannot pass side by side, the extra volume of traffic that six house would bring, as well as the sight lines exiting the proposed site, Low street would become a dangerous highway, not just to other vehicles, but also to foot traffic, as there is no public footpath.
1003	2	Since the development by Miller Homes, and the extra volume of traffic that it has brought to Low Street, not taking into account the many houses that still stand empty, I believe Low Street cannot cope now, never mind with six more large houses, with double garages, using it as their main entrance and exit road. From my experience of living on Low Street, I believe that the infrastructure is not there for more development, all but in name it is not a street, but a lane.
1003	3	With much new recent development, not just on the Miller Homes site, there are many houses around the village stood empty, I believe that Gringley cannot cope with more expansion as the impact is still yet to be felt from the building of 68 new homes.
1003	4	I hope you can appreciate our concerns as we are all for new development, but feel that Gringley has had more then it's fair share in recent times.
1004	1	I am absolutely amazed that you, Bassetlaw Council, are proposing to build 600 dwelling on land the area of Bracken Lane / Grove Coach Road area. As you know well, this is a flood area. Some years ago, the then Planning Team, turned down an application to build at the end of Bracken Lane – if my memory serves me right! What has changed? It is still a flood area.
1004	2	Another concern is the added traffic problem. 600 dwellings = 600 vehicles and probably more, 1200 as most homes these days, have two cars! The chaos that this will cause for us who already live here. Already we have the school traffic to contend with. Sometimes the service bus is unable to keep to its route. Because of parked cars both sides of Rose Avenue. As you will notice I live in Denison Avenue and need access to London Road, already have long delays as it is, but with X number of extra cars it will be so much worse.
1005	1	Gringley already is seeing 68 new properties some of which are social housing in accordance with guidelines.
1005	2	There are little facilities in the village and as necessity cars are mostly used to go about one's daily life.
1005	3	When completed there will be a great increase in traffic, Low Street is one of the narrowest roads where two cars cannot pass and obviously six more houses with residents and visitors onto this small road will add to the problems that arise already form time to time.
1005	4	The open space for public use would also be a cause for concern to us. It would run the length of our property and be approximately 1 metre from out windows. Therefore its use as a public place would affect our privacy.
1005	5	As stated the land is in a conservation area and as such we have no objection to the bungalow being updated, the planning of which was obtained 4 years ago.
1005	6	It would be a pity to see Gringley village desecrated as others have been by allowing building in everyone's back garden.
1006	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
1006	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
1006	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
1006	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
1006	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
1006	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
1006	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
1006	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
1007	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
1007	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1007	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
1007	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
1007	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
1007	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
1007	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
1007	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
1008	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
1008	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
1008	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
1008	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
1008	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
1008	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
1008	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
1008	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
1009	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
1009	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
1009	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
1009	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
1009	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
1009	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
1009	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1009	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
1010	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
1010	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
1010	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
1010	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
1010	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
1010	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
1010	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
1010	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
1011	1	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35. This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.
1011	2	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
1011	3	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
1011	4	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
1011	5	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
1011	6	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
1011	7	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
1011	8	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
1011	9	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
1012	1	In response to the above document I would like to record my opposition to any building on site number 35. This land must be protected as an important amenity for the enrichment of present and future generations.
1012	2	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1012	3	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
1012	4	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
1012	5	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
1012	6	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
1012	7	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
1012	8	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
1012	9	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
1013	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
1013	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
1013	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
1013	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
1013	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
1013	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
1013	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
1013	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
1014	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
1014	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
1014	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
1014	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
1014	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
1014	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
1014	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
1014	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
1015	1	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
1015	2	Increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1015	3	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape.
1015	4	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
1015	5	The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
1015	6	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment.
1015	7	This bridleway is used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users. The loss of this countryside would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Plantation.
1015	8	Our local shops which are sited off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, especially as one of the shops became an ASDA. Additional housing will cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas.
1015	9	Our local schools (primary, secondary and school based nurseries) are already at capacity.
1016	1	No possible provision of safe access to Moorgate Hill and/or Welham Rd. Inadequate access to Moorgate Hill from Tiln Lane -Single access point to proposed development of 1130 houses. Volume of traffic -over 1300 extra cars -would congest junction of Tiln Lane and Moorgate. Knock on effects would congest the Welham Rd./Lid get Lane junction and onto Spital Hill and its traffic lights If the junction were enlarged with a button roundabout or traffic lights the Welham Rd. and Moorgate routes would be congested and the major route out of town blocked at peak times The only possible road access development to Welham Rd. and Moorgate would be through Longholme Rd. -a wholly inadequate solution due to the restricted width of Longholme Rd .
1016	2	Heavy goods traffic Extreme danger from mix of HGVs No bypass of Welham Rail Bridge as promised for the last 25 years, leaving over 1300 extra cars to fight for space with HGV's.
1016	3	Local development plan Lack of industry and commerce Environmental issues around massive increase in commuting to major centres -Sheffield/Lincoln/Doncaster/Nottingham etc. Creation of poor quality social housing area with little access to employment
1016	4	Loss of high quality farmland
1016	5	Drainage and sewerage removal issues Massive new works needed to avoid complete overload of present system and sewage contamination
1016	6	Provision of Primary education New school/new school places will be needed at great extra cost and stretching of existing provision
1017	1	The present infrastructure would find it difficult to cope with a maximum of 18 houses. The drainage system is inadequate and there is no mains gas or post office. An addition the broadband is so slow it is virtually unusable.
1017	2	We would say 10 houses maximum without changing the whole nature of the village.
1017	3	383 (if 10)
1017	4	Part of site 480 allowing for the business premises to remain (if 18)
1017	5	480 (as explained above)
1017	6	No
1017	7	All outside the envelope should be protected
1017	8	No there are plenty of sites in the area already. Other authorities could share the burden
1017	9	No more sites. If there had to be they should be together. Why more special treatment
1017	10	No!!!
1018	1	I'd say a max of 18 unless there is more infrastructure including gas, broadband, water, post office etc.
1018	2	505, 506.
1018	3	Yes
1018	4	No
1018	5	Should be protected. A public space by the river would be nice.
1018	6	REMOVED
1018	7	Together. Minimise crime
1018	8	No
1019	1	6 houses seems about right
1019	2	Not 101 – across dual carriageway,
1019	3	Not 496 and 451 – too far from village centre.
1019	4	For development – small part of 106
1019	5	The starred area is better suited for residential

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1019	6	The pub should be sited in the original place, which was turned down by planning. It makes more sense to keep it further from most houses and nearer the by-pass to attract out-of-village customers
1019	7	Yes
1020	1	The volume of traffic already using each road means it is busy. Each new house means at least one extra car!! What would keep it safe?
1020	2	The volume of traffic (above) then has to go onto London Road – it already takes a long time to get onto London Road! What will they do?
1020	3	Several years ago a similar development was turned down because of drainage issues, the water flows under Grove Street, under the Market Square and Bridgegate. Has this been up-graded to carry the extra water?
1020	4	REMOVED
1021	1	The estate would be too far from the main bus service into town.
1021	2	Please consider the distance to the shops, the Health Centre, schools and a church.
1021	3	The few shops in Ordsall are already a safety hazard at peak times with cars -this would be made worse. There is a danger to adults and children on foot.
1021	4	All of these reasons would make people more car reliant (not good for the people and not good for the environment).
1021	5	If there are no new schools in the offing, the present schools could be overcrowded.
1021	6	More houses would be under the flight path of planes landing and taking off from Gamston Aerodrome.
1021	7	The expansion into the green belt would cause problems to the wild life in the area. There is other land (not in the green belt) nearer to Retford not developed, and why aren't derelict and empty houses updated to modern houses, which would be less expensive, more resourceful and better for the environment?
1021	8	Ordsall Bridge is a bad hazard: Two big vehicles cannot pass on the bridge; this causes a build up of traffic both ways. This would be made worse with more traffic. Traffic going south would have a similar situation over the narrow bridge at Eaton. Cycling over Ordsall Bridge is very dangerous as is trying to push a pram or walk with young children on the very narrow path with traffic very near to the curb edge. There is no cycle lane in Ordsall at the moment. This is a hazard for people cycling to work, school or into town.
1021	9	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments
1021	10	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1021	11	In addition there will be a significant loss of amenity,
1021	12	Which the local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1021	13	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing
1021	14	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1022	1	We have seen the above mentioned document, and are most concerned at the possibility of building houses in the areas marked 3, 370, 488 and 511, with a 'maximum potential capacity' of 570 houses. Number 370 and 511 were rejected for development some years ago after very strong protest by residents in the neighbourhood. Their objections were sustained because of three main considerations, none of which have substantially changed over the intervening years.
1022	2	The first, and possibly the most important and fundamental problem is drainage. Inevitably, it would have to be most effective to cope with the run-off from the Grove hills. The areas put forward are part of the flood plain, very wet in winter and often partially under water. The properties at the bottom of Grove Coach Road and St. Helens Road were flooded in recent years, and their susceptibility would increase with additional and waste water from the proposed number of new houses. In our view, the inadequacy of the drainage alone is enough to prevent further building in this part of Retford.
1022	3	The second objection is the increase in traffic that would be generated. This would cause massive inconvenience, and delays, particularly at sensitive points such as junctions of London Road and Bracken Lane or Grove Coach Road. On Bracken Lane there would be an increased danger to the children going to and from the school.
1022	4	Lastly, if there were an urgent need in Retford for new houses these areas would not be suitable because they lack the necessary infrastructure. For example, Bracken Land School is already full and the next nearest school would probably be unable to accommodate the children who are likely to move in
1022	5	We attended the meeting in Retford, and heard of the need for positive recommendations, because of the government's requirement. If it is necessary to build 6000 houses in the next few years, we would propose the development of the sites numbered 3 and 27.
1022	6	It is accessible, being adjacent to London Road, and would not aggravate traffic problems on Bracken Lane or Grove Coach Road
1022	7	Some infrastructure is already in place and children would be able to attend either Bracken Lane school or Thrumpton
1022	8	Such development would put to good use land no longer required by the garden businesses
1023	1	I think the two Brownfield sites should be brought back into industrial use. There is already adequate building land to cover the town's needs without encroaching beyond the present outskirts of the town. More detailed explanations in attached sheet.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1023	2	I believe that housing development should only be permitted on the smaller sites and that speculative building should only be allowed in circumstances of need and where evidence of demand is produced . Building on small sites is usually to provide upgrade housing for local residents and this benefits first time buyers because cheaper property is released on to the market.
1023	3	I think employment land should be used only to create employment. This could of course include community projects where some employment is created e.g. Leisure, Health or Education. I do not agree that land previously used as employment land should be allocated to housing. However I do appreciate that housing needs to be available and would therefore advise that house building land adjacent to employment land should be retained to support any employment land development.
1023	4	On the whole yes open spaces should be retained. An annual review of current open spaces should be made to ensure they are well maintained and being beneficially used. Spaces which are not used or become derelict should be considered for other purposes which could include housing or community facilities if appropriate.
1023	5	In circumstances where they are no longer used redevelopment can be undertaken but I feel that the immediate local residents should be consulted.
1023	6	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes.
1023	7	Thorny subject. If Gypsies and Travellers are willing to join society and contribute to the benefit of their local community then sites should be made available.
1023	8	It would seem appropriate that temporary sites should be available as part of planning permission for mobile caravan sites.
1023	9	With all the work that the planning department has carried out surely it has identified potential areas.
1023	10	My main concern is the agricultural and meadow land (referred to here after as agricultural land) that you have brought into the plan for consideration. There is already more than an adequate amount of developable land within Retford without having to consider this agricultural land. Please refer to your list of 'issues that can be considered' to refuse planning consent.
1023	11	With the exception of items ITCBC 1, 6 and 11 an application for planning on any agricultural site would be contrary to the planning policies of the Council. I note you have stated that applications for development will be considered on an individual basis. Unless the Council are going to consider 'done deals' I am certain every case will be contested by the general public. The Council will be involved in considerable costs to defend decisions that go against applicants. Public hearings may be required. Local rate payers do not wish to contribute to these costs. Exclusions of the land at this stage will avoid any unnecessary work and costs in the future. Most agricultural land is registered for the purposes of the 'Single payment subsidies' given where the owner complies with certain regulations relating to farming and environmental matters. Any attempt to convert agricultural land into building land would seriously disturb the environment including the loss of trees and hedgerows, ecological habitats and landscapes and will impact on public visual amenity. Agricultural land must be taken out of potential developable land, it is not needed. Don't forget that agriculture is a major industry in rural Bassetlaw. Is it the Councils intention now to create unemployment in this industry as they did when they granted permission to develop land previously occupied by manufacturing industries in Retford? Although you have highlighted that there will be infrastructural matters to the overcome, you have obviously not made any serious attempt to think through the issues. Developers will only carry out the minimum of work to cover issues.
1023	12	If you look at all the agricultural land on the eastern side of the map you will note that there are no roadways suitable to take traffic for a total of approx. 1700 houses. Unless everyone is going to work in the Gainsborough area they will have to travel in or through the town to get to Doncaster, Worksop, Sheffield or Newark. Drainage and pollution will be other issues. I appreciate that developers are expected to contribute to some facilities in the town but will they contribute to new major roads. To travel west the River Idle will have to be bridged as will be the Chesterfield canal.
1023	13	Does the Council have in hand plans to expand the town centre area to accommodate the influx of new residents. Can it provide further parking in the town centre. If it does not then it is likely that the existing residents will seek alternative shopping areas frustrated by the lack of parking in the town centre area.
1023	14	Retford is Retford. It does not need to expand into green field sites. Retford does not wish to become a larger town and the Council should take note of this. Building should only be permitted on larger sites where it can be proven that it is for the benefit of the town and that new employment has arisen which require additional housing (see also my comments in sections 2 and 3 following).
1023	15	Areas 512 and 37 providing some 231 houses will no doubt be brought onto either Smeath Lane or Tiln Lane. This is also the only way into town for high vehicles. Congestion at the junction of Tiln Lane at Moorgate Hill is already a problem. There are no main drainage schemes in place. We are in a valley and the lowest area appears between the Idle and the Chesterfield canal. This is where the accumulated surface water will go. We already have a flood plain risk. Building in these areas will increase that risk which may also impact on houses already in existence.
1023	16	I have reservations with regard to areas 304,41 and part of 40 and 52 (see section 2 below)
1023	17	The areas that I consider should be taken out are sites 1, 52, 40, 3, 370, 511, 69, 46, 309, 6, 7, 37, and 512. According to the plans these areas would reduce the availability of houses by 2410.
1023	18	I believe that the Council should be seeking to bring into town some manufacturing, industrial or commercial business to utilise existing brown field sites. This really should be taken to be a priority before any large scale house building commences. Sites 259 and R2 are prime examples. The Council should be actively seeking to bring employment into town. If they are not then why should we be required to make available land for housing development. Can the Retford local councillors not stand up and say that we will provide land for housing development but only if we can see a benefit to the town by way of new and additional employment or additional trade for our local traders.
1023	19	I therefore consider that the areas 259 and R2 together with area 364, part of 52 and part of 40, as appropriate, should be earmarked for employment development with housing and other localised facilities for the benefit of the town as a whole. These areas should not be used for any other purpose and certainly not solely for housing development. Access to major roads from this area should not be difficult to create.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1023	20	A strategic attempt to develop this area for the benefit of employment should already be part of the local plan. The provision of 290 houses on area 364 as part of the scheme would be reasonable. However if more houses are required to support the employment development then one or two rows could be considered adjacent to the existing houses areas 41, 52 and 40. Permission should not be granted for housing on these areas unless the developers build factory, industrial or commercial units on sites 259 and R2.
1023	21	A similar situation arises with regard to sites 51 and R7 although this would need to be smaller industrial or commercial units. On your availability assessment plan you had earmarked part of this site as 'suitable for housing'. I would suggest that this area be restored to housing so that this could be another employment based development with housing. In your availability assessment you had also earmarked other adjacent sites as developable. It is possible that this could be car parking for the units. I again consider that this area should also be retained for employment development with housing and a willing developer should be found.
1023	22	Suggested Plan to Provide Available Land to Meet Retford's Needs. I believe that the Council should make it clear to the government that Bassetlaw (or Retford) area, maintains sufficient land for appropriate development based on known demand and not based on anticipation or national statistics. If necessary assistance should be sought to market the employment land as part of the towns development plan I would accept that the Council wish to prove to the government that it has identified land for development but it will only allow small parcels of land within the towns boundaries to be used for speculative housing. Perhaps you would care to ask the governments environmentalists to confirm whether or not in their opinion, agricultural land should be taken for housing or employment development. I think you will find that they will be against the use of any Greenfield site. Based on the information available relating to the Councils development plan, I consider that there is adequate land available for housing development on a 15 year plan in the following areas, subject of course to approval: (TABLE OF SITES AND HOUSING NUMBERS PROVIDED)
1023	23	Your plan does not take into account all land in the town that could be brought into account if really required. There are rumours that Carr Hill school could be developed. There does not appear to be any mention of the Old Grammar school which could be converted to accommodation without external appearance alteration. There are other windfall sites. I therefore consider that my presentation is adequate for your purposes.
1023	24	The above covers a period 2006/21 and is clearly adequate for that period. I understand that reviews are carried out annually to ensure that sufficient land is available for both employment and housing needs that are known to date. Local developers will find suitable small sites to ensure that a steady flow of land becomes available in the future.
1023	25	As far as I can see your overall requirement of 2002 houses by year 2028 is based on statistics. I have not seen any evidence of demand. There are still numerous properties developed over the past few years that have not been sold or let. It would be advisable not to grant permission of any larger development sites until the empty properties in town have been taken.
1023	26	Apart from small developments of say up to 20 houses all applications should provide evidence of demand for the houses. To increase Council revenues the Council should seek the right to access property that has been completed but unoccupied after more than one year from completion of the building shell. Possibly a sliding scale stating at 25%of final rateable value rising to 75% say after 3 years. This may be controversial but business premise owners have to pay.
1023	27	My final request. Do not destroy our town and its rural countryside by developing agricultural land.
1024	1	Any proposal of housing at the above should be discouraged and empty properties, brown sites developed, leaving greenbelt and open spaces undeveloped.
1024	2	Worksop should be left as a small town and not turned into Mansfield, Doncaster etc.
1025	1	Having observed the situation in the town of Retford, I note a great deal of activity already in hand on building sites and this in spite of the fact that there appears to be a large number of houses/apartments standing empty.
1025	2	Regarding the proposed sites for further development, many if these I imagine have problems with potential flooding,
1025	3	And also access from these new estates would severely affect traffic movement on roads in peak travelling times, particularly the London Road area. There would be a very real increased risk for children going to and from the schools in Bracken Lane and Trumpton Lane and these schools are for the younger age group!
1025	4	Also, would these schools be able to accommodate an influx of new pupils – very doubtful! So where would new appropriate facilities be built?
1025	5	Having said all the above it must be pointed out that there is very little employment in Retford now and with the increased cost of travel, be it public transport or the use of one's own car, is this a well thought plan?
1026	1	We oppose the proposed housing development on Kilton Forest Golf Course and the land should remain a leisure activity which is used by young and old male and female seven days a week. It is ideal for both shift workers and day workers and in the summer can be used till late at night, it is a reasonably priced activity and by changing this you would be putting people out of work, and spoiling a sport for many people some who travel from out of town to use it.
1027	1	I have lived in my bungalow 4 years and are very happy here so I am very upset the land might be used for developing.
1027	2	I use the land for my weekly organised walk with the Bassetlaw walking group I enjoy it and many use the walk to exercise their dogs.
1027	3	Also the golf course is used by many from early morning until late in the evening in rain, snow, frost, wind.
1027	4	I thought the land to be a greenbelt area and involves many bridle paths. I am sure we have enough houses in Worksop. I hope the development doesn't happen on site number 4.
1028	1	We have lived here in Dryden Dale for at least 30 years. We did not have a golf course then but now I see young men and old boys and ladies going for a day out golfing on just a fine day out.
1028	2	Plus there is a bowling green which my partially sighted son uses, where will he go if it is up for future housing development.
1028	3	There is also the field to the top side of the golf course which people use for a variety of sports or just running around.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1028	4	I don't think that the famous names belonging to golf who come from the area will be very pleased now they have put Worksop Kilton Golf club on the map. I prefer that there is legacy for the club after the time and trouble that residents and the Council went to, to get a working mans golf club.
1029	1	Kilton Forest Golf course is a public amenity and as such should be preserved for future generations, not grabbed up to provide space for houses. If it was the only site available throughout the whole of Worksop District then I would have no grounds for objecting.
1029	2	Living as I do, next to the course I have seen it being built and developed over the years and now the trees and bushes and shrubs have grown into maturity. Surely from a purely environmental point of view to replace grass and trees with a housing estate is to increase the carbon footprint at a time when this country is committed to reducing it. It is pleasing to look out over the course to the trees and fields beyond. O.K. it is not as pretty as the Augusta National course in Georgia, but I would still be very sorry to see it go.
1030	1	I object to your ill thought through plans for development in and around Retford. As a local Council, you should be representing the wishes of the townspeople, not forcing us to accept plans that we do not want. Retford is an historic market town and we should be preserving its character for future generations to enjoy, and not building more nondescript, poorly designed, houses to complement those already blotting the landscape where Bridon Wire and the Beehive Works were situated.
1030	2	I particularly object to your plans to build around Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road as this area is unsuitable for a number of reasons. Whilst I understand this area is not designated a flood plain, there are severe problems with drainage which would require a massive investment to alleviate. The ground is lower than that surrounding it, so water would need to be collected and pumped out, which may still not be adequate to cope with flood events such as occurred in June 2007.
1030	3	The area already struggles to cope with peak traffic and there is not the space to widen roads or provide roundabouts or large controlled junctions to ease traffic flow. Bracken Lane cannot be widened until the end of the 30 mph zone at the West end and Grove Coach lane is also constricted until it reaches the fields. Traffic would start using the lanes to Little Gringley, which currently could not cope, and Grove Lane may be suitable for widening, but when it becomes Grove Street, nothing can be done due to housing and the canal bridge. To use the proposed access off London Road down the lane North of Bracken Lane, I should think that you would need to compulsory purchase peoples' gardens to allow for a width suitable for two cars to pass. Once you do get off the proposed estates what then? The road South towards the A1 may be able to cope, but head towards town and London Road regularly backs up to the Elms Hotel and that is the start of one long queue to get through town. To go through Ordsall requires the negotiation of the small bridge over the Idle and the narrow roads leading either direction of this, as well as adding to the traffic from the new Bridon Wire housing estate. I don't see how this infrastructure could be upgraded without major investment and the demolition of several properties; or are you going to build a big flyover or outer ring road for the town?
1030	4	There are then the wider aspects of services within the town. The Council claims that capacities of facilities such as Schools, Health Care and Leisure provisions will be increased, but how are these to be guaranteed and who will pay for them? What steps have been taken to cater for all of the people who may move into the Bridon and Beehive sites up to date? I have not noticed any change in local services to cope with the demands of these two large developments, so why would the Council do anything different in future? Where are these extra people supposed to work once they move to Retford? Are you in negotiation with any large businesses to bring jobs into the area? If the whole of Bassetlaw, Newark and Sherwood and Mansfield are to have thousands of homes built, then where are the thousands of jobs for these people going to come from? If you do have to work against the wishes of residents and further destroy the character of our town, then I suggest you build in the area marked 51 & R7 on the Bassetlaw Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation Paper. At least the infrastructure surrounding this area may be able to cope with your plans.
1030	5	If you do have to work against the wishes of residents and further destroy the character of our town, then I suggest you build in the area marked 51&R7 on the Bassetlaw Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation Paper. At least the infrastructure surrounding this area may be able to cope with your plans.
1031	1	Building on area well know to flood
1031	2	Inadequate drainage
1031	3	Road access already congested - Emergency services compromised
1031	4	Bracken Lane Primary School already has outstanding intake appeals
1031	5	Access around Retford to the Secondary schools very poor from these areas
1031	6	Within conservation area's
1031	7	Doctors Surgeries are at opposite side of Retford
1031	8	Although we are against ANY future development around Retford due to the lack of job opportunities; leisure facilities; local amenities; keeping the character of a 'Market Town' etc. etc. we would suggest that any future build take place on the Northern part of town which have better access facilities to schools, doctors etc. These sites would be Nos 571; 572; 51; 37; 512 & 7
1032	1	I cannot believe this location is even being considered as it is the only Municipal Golf course in the region and provides an alternative to the private courses which are well out of the cost parameters of a very large proportion of the local population.
1032	2	In addition there are large areas of brown field sites within Bassetlaw which would be much better utilised for housing than removing a Greenfield site that is much loved by golfers, dog walkers and ramblers alike.
1032	3	I also cannot believe the council are considering removing a sporting facility, is this not totally against the current agenda to promote healthy life styles and fight obesity, with this being our countries Olympic year what a rubbish message this proposal is sending out.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1033	1	We would like to express are concerns about the letter we received from you. We would like you to put our objection to the council or anyone within their power to STOP any proposed development on the Kilton Golf Club. We bought our house 8 years ago because it over looks the Golf Course and we would like it to remain that way, my husband plays on the course and he says it is very well used, so why take away something that gives a lot of people a lot of pleasure.
1034	1	Our main concern is that there will be a lot greater traffic generation on Tiln Lane which is already dangerous because of all the Heavy Goods Vehicles that are diverted onto it because of the low railway bridge at Welham. All this extra traffic will only add to the already dangerous condition. All this traffic has to pass Carr Hill School which is already dangerously congested at school arrival and leaving times.
1034	2	here was a child killed on this road a year or two ago so we feel that to put even more traffic on this road would be criminal
1034	3	Our next concern is the extra demand on an already overworked sewerage system in this area. There is also some localised flooding because of inadequate top water drainage.
1035	1	If there are any major hazard sites and pipelines, or associated consultation zones, within the Local Development Plan, it would be helpful to indicate to potential developers the constraints likely to be imposed by their presence. The paragraphs in the attached annex could form the basis of a policy statement for inclusion in the plan, which may subsequently avoid the submission of planning application containing inappropriate proposal.
1035	2	In addition, we suggest that the proposal map be market to show the location of any major hazard sites. We particularly recommend marking the routes od any major hazard pipelines as, in our experience, most incidents involving damage to buried pipelines occur because third parties are not aware of their presence.
1035	3	HSE will advise you should there be any changes in how HSE provides land use planning advice as a result of recommendation on the integration of societal risk into the planning system around major hazard sites made by the Major Incident Investigation Board into the fire and explosions at the Buncefield Oil Storage Depot, HSE's proposals for revised policies to address societal risk around onshore non –nuclear major hazard installations, or other developments in the planning sphere
1036	1	I have no objections, I will be sad to loose the uninterrupted views from my back garden that we have enjoyed for the past 28 years, however, I understand that these new developments will provide homes and employment for the people of Worksop, which can only be a positive move.
1036	2	I only have one suggestion, and that is, from conversations I have had with people in my area and age group, that there is a shortage of affordable Bungalows in this area for people approaching Retirement, this would be a perfect site for such a development.
1037	1	Whilst we support the principle of utilising site assessment criteria to assess the suitability of respective sites for development as the right and proper course of action, it is the interpretation of the 'scoring system' and its outcomes that is critical to deciding which site should come forward. The setting up of a green, amber and red system to score each criterion should be seen as a guide and not as an absolute method of determining which sites should come for development. A totting up approach of scoring greens ambers and reds is too simplistic and potentially flawed. Paragraph 2.17 of the supporting text states that it is not the Council's intention to rank the sites, yet the remainder of the paragraph and the following paragraph 2.18 conversely suggest that ranking of sites is in fact what the Council is proposing to do. There are a number of issues that need to be considered in the interpretation of the 'scoring system' and which mitigate against applying a simple scoring system. I set out examples below:
1037	2	Weighting -Should all nine criteria be given equal weight or are some criteria more fundamental to the site selection? I would suggest for example that criteria 2· compatibility with neighbouring land uses -is more important than criteria 4 ·Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land • of particularly as the Council are not generally looking at many 'strategic' scale housing sites of over 20 ha which is the threshold at which Defra is to be formally consulted on the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.
1037	3	The consideration of Constraints -The larger the site, and / or the more complex the site in terms of its capacity for mixed use, the greater the prospect of development constraints being identified. Clearly if significant constraints cannot be overcome then in many cases the site should not be developed. However there will inevitably be large <i>and or</i> mixed use sites which have some constraints, albeit capable of resolution, that will result in a site that could deliver major sustainability benefits, being marked down to an amber rating. Other smaller greenfield sites which deliver limited community benefit could however secure a higher green rating
1037	4	Criterion 5 . Impacts on Water Source Protection Zones -this criterion potentially generates a conflict in that sites in the major (sustainable) settlements may well be scored amber or red, whilst sites in less sustainable locations may score green by virtue of not falling with in an SPZ. Given that housing is not considered as a polluting activity, we would question the merit of including this criterion for housing assessments as it has the potential to downgrade sites on the basis of location within a graduated SPZ despite having negligible impact thereon.
1037	5	In our opinion, there should be an additional 'local infrastructure' category which assesses sites in respect of their ability to support existing community facilities and infrastructure <i>or</i> deliver enhanced facilities as part of the site allocation. Criterion 3 -delivery of economic development opportunity -is the only criteria which positively scores sites for delivering economic development yet there are wider benefits that should be taken into account when the suitability of a site is being assessed. For example, the ability of a site to support local facilities should be recognised, as should sites which can deliver facilities for which the local community has identified a specific need. For example the opportunity for a major site to deliver a primary school site, or for a smaller rural site to deliver a local play area or school playing field extension are tangible and material benefits that individual sites can deliver, yet these considerations fall outside the current range of assessment criteria. Our request to the Council is to be pragmatic and look at critically at all the benefits that a site has to offer and not to be too focused on the traffic light scoring system

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1037	6	We have expressed the view in responding to the Core Strategy that we consider that the scale of housing promoted for Harworth-Bircotes for the plan period to 2028 is not deliverable having particular regard to the marketability of the settlement and long term historically low housing completion rates. The regeneration agenda for the town is acknowledged yet the housing delivery expectations are wholly unrealistic. In submitting Core Strategy representations we proposed that the proportion of housing proposed for Harworth-Bircotes be reduced from 22% to 16% and the residual 6% (around 462 dwellings) reallocated to Retford and Worksop where annual housing completion rates are four times that achieved at Harworth-Bircotes and these settlements continue to be far more likely to deliver the 462 housing completions in question, than by placing unrealistic delivery expectations upon Harworth.
1037	7	On behalf of our clients, the Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, we are promoting housing development of up to 200 dwellings on land to the west of North Road as part of a larger mixed use site development of around 25 hectares taking in sites 51j571/572jR6 as illustrated at Figure 5.2 of the consultation document. More detailed supporting comment in respect of the overall mixed-use scheme is contained in the response to Question 12. The residential development site extends to approximately six hectares and sits comfortably adjacent to existing residential areas to the south east and across North Road to the east. The presence of a retained HV electricity cable effectively constrains the north western limits of residential development and in this general location a buffer zone of open spaces and a local commercial area (serving both proposed residential and employment areas) is proposed. The residential development will be accessed via a new priority junction from North Road in a location that has been agreed in principle with the Highway Authority and indicated on the Masterplan accompanying these representations. There is scope for an internal access road to link the proposed housing directly to the employment area to the north west if required and/or expedient. The residential development will deliver a new dedicated length of off-road cycleway linking the full extent of the proposed housing and employment areas to the existing cycleway along North Road into Retford town centre.
1037	8	The technical studies undertaken to date confirm that the residential site is viable and deliverable. It is a vital part of the overall mixed use scheme not only in terms of providing the linkages referred to above, but in terms of its significant contribution to funding the extent of infrastructure that will be necessary to service the substantial extensions to the Trinity Park Industrial Estate. The Trinity Hospital is not a residential developer and so will utilise receipts from residential land sales to service and bring forward onward phases of Trinity Park which they administer through their appointed land agents. In the lead in to this consultation, the respondents were notified of a potential requirement for an new school site to the north of Retford to accommodate children arising from housing development site(s) that may be allocated on the northern side of the town.
1037	9	In this consultation response, The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity have Signalled their willingness to assist the Education Authority and have identified a possible primary school site on Randall Way. This site is part owned by the Trinity Hospital and part owned by Bassetlaw District Council.
1037	10	On behalf of our clients, the Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, we are promoting employment development of up to 19 hectares on land east and west of North Road as part of a larger mixed use site development of around 25 hectares taking in sites 51/571/572/R6 as illustrated at Figure 5.2 of the consultation document. More detailed supporting comment in respect of the overall mixed-use scheme is contained in the response to question 12 The illustrative Masterplans accompanying this submission identify the potential to accommodate 81/82/ BB units of varying sizes on the landholding, with a footprint coverage in the region of 35,500m ² • In addition, provision is made for other economic uses including local scale retail uses which can serve both proposed employment and residential areas. There are two principal points of access available to the employment area:-a new gateway roundabout feature at the hub of the site linking both economic development areas east and west of North road; and, a priority junction at the north western end of the site. These accesses have been discussed and agreed in principle with the Highway Authority along with extension to the 40 mph speed limit. A new dedicated cycleway bisects the employment area and links through to the proposed residential area to the south east. The intervening commercial and open area provides an appropriate buffer between industrial and residential uses.
1037	11	On behalf of our clients, the Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, we are promoting a mixed use development of up to 200 dwellings on land to the west of North Road as part of a larger mixed use site development of around 25 hectares taking in sites 51/571/572/R6 as illustrated at Figure 5.2 of the consultation document. This proposal builds on the successful Trinity Park Industrial Estate development which is located to the northwest of the town centre in a favourable and accessible location. Over the last two years Trinity Hospital have invested in preliminary technical studies on highways, flood risk, archaeology, service & utility infrastructure and master planning and can draw this together into an initial Site Masterplan which supports this representation. The Masterplan and the range of mixed use indicated thereon are for discussion at this stage yet highlights the capacity in this accessible location to deliver: The Masterplan takes due account of the electric cables to be retained, water and gas main easements in defining residential, employment, educational and community/retail facilities in a comprehensive scheme. The access arrangements have been agreed in principle with the Highway Authority, comprising priority junctions at the northern and southern ends of the site areas serving the employment and residential areas of the site respectively, and a central roundabout which opens up prominent, prestige site opportunities on either side of the North Road at a gateway entrance into the town. This highway strategy can be implemented within the highway and on land controlled by the site owners but will require a extension of the 40mph speed limit further out of the current town limits again acceptable in principle with the Highway Authority. The Masterplan includes a sustainable range of mixed uses which we consider tube complementary to the residential use yet will not conflict with the role and function of Retford town centre. It is essential that both the housing and employment allocations are confirmed together as the combination is required to support the cost of the service and highway infrastructure necessary to secure the comprehensive development of the site and the employment opportunities. The proposals are not set in stone but are considered to represent an indicative and viable mix of development which will appeal to the housing and employment market for development in the short to medium term of the plan period. The location of the respective uses on the Masterplan is largely as shown on the plan at Figure S.2 although the residential area is slightly smaller due to the constraint of a retained high voltage cable cutting across the site. This area has subsequently been identified as suitable for local facilities. There is limited scope to substantially alter the balance of uses due to the site constraints yet Trinity Hospital consider that the balance is about right, with the residential element bringing major sustainability credentials and not least higher value returns to fund service infrastructure for the onward development phases of the enlarged Trinity Park Employment area.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1037	12	In recent years, Retford has seen the 1055 of traditional industries and a loss of sites to housing development. At the same time a number of replacement employment sites identified in the Bassetlaw local Plan have been constrained by limitation to the B Class uses, and some to the extent of a restriction solely to 81 uses. In some case these limitations have been too restrictive and the town has missed out on employment opportunities that a more flexible approach to employment land would have delivered. Retford is not in a strong enough position to dictate the composition of its employment base and as such must be reactive to accommodate employment opportunities that come along by taking a flexible approach to its employment land portfolio of which the Trinity landholding is arguably its strongest asset
1037	13	In locations such as Retford, it is imperative that a very flexible approach to economic development is adopted within PPS4. It is not possible to anticipate the uses that employers may wish to bring to the sites and therefore constraints must not be imposed which prevent sites from accommodating the uses that arise. The policy text should provide for allocated sites to accommodate, where appropriate, non B Class uses. This issue was raised at the hearing into a Core Strategy for a neighbouring Authority recently and, as a consequence, amendments were incorporated to provide for the potential contribution of other employment uses such as Hotels, Health and Fitness, Specialist Care and sui-generis uses such as car dealerships. The suggested policy amendment did not detail specific alternative uses, but set out criteria for their consideration. The wording of the proposed amendment that could be applied to sites identified within the Bassetlaw Site Allocations DPD
1037	14	This approach is promoted from the outset in respect of the Trinity Hospital landholding on North Road and is reflected in the indicative Masterplan which supports these representations
1038	1	We do not support the approach to delivering housing numbers in settlements based purely on resident's surveys on the number of new homes they desire to see in their village and are concerned that the suggested housing distribution targets across the RSC's appear to have been based solely on the findings of the resident's surveys. It would appear that little or no consideration has been given to the Bassetlaw DC LDF document: ' <i>Services and Facilities Study</i> ' undertaken in September 2009 or the 2011 Infrastructure study for the <i>Core Strategy and Development Plan Management Policies</i> . Should the services and facilities for each of the RSC, and their respective capacities be taken into consideration, the share or distribution of the suggested 10% of the overall housing growth for Bassetlaw, could well be different.
1038	2	We consider that the housing growth for Walkeringham should be 14 houses as an absolute minimum and that favourable consideration should be given towards additional development within the village if the can help deliver additional affordable to meet local needs housing than the 35% aspiration and or other facilities which are required/ desired within the village. The Walkeringham village survey indicates that nearly half of the respondents knew of people in need of affordable housing accommodation. Given also that the Core Strategy places Walkeringham in the highest category of targeted affordable housing delivery at 35%, it would appear that there is affordable need in the village which should mitigate towards a flexible (higher) housing target if it can deliver a needed affordable homes in the village.
1038	3	On behalf of our land owning client Mr G D Strawson we promote the allocation of part of the site reference 438 which wraps around the primary school, and close to the main village facilities. The site lies at a focal point within the village and development would broadly 'contained' by surrounding built form. Comprising the Primary School, and the larger Grange Farmstead at the eastern end of the High Street.
1038	4	Our client has been approached previously by the school /education authority to ascertain whether they would be willing to dispose of a parcel of land immediately to the east of the school to increase the school footprint. This area is shown on the plan below. Our client was happy in principle to proceed with the transfer yet this did not unfortunately proceed at the time due to the implications of uplift clause applied by the previous land owner. We would confirm however that should part of this site be allocated for housing as broadly proposed in the indicative block plan then the land can be dedicated to the school at no cost to the education authority. The school has recently confirmed that they remain very interested in acquiring the land and this will be discussed at a meeting to be attended by representatives of the school and Parish Council in early February 2012. The school acquisition of the landholding would facilitate expansion of the school and or its outdoor facilities, requirement which feature very highly in the village questionnaire.
1038	5	The Walkeringham village survey also revealed that the highest level of respondents to the questionnaires wished to see a play area within the village. In this regard, the landowners are again willing to dedicate land for a play area and consider that the land immediately to the north of the school playing field ideal for such facilities, as shown on the very indicative plan below. Contributions towards equipping the area could be considered as part of the overall package of proposal for the site. We consider that as part of a small housing development, the play area would be an ideal, secure and overlooked location conveniently sited adjacent to the primary school. Again we propose to discuss this opportunity with the Parish Council at out February meeting.
1039	1	Whilst we support the principle of utilising site assessment criteria to assess the suitability of respective sites for development as the right and proper course of action, it is the interpretation of the 'scoring system' and its outcomes that is critical to deciding which site should come forward. The setting up of a green, amber and red system for each criteria should be seen as a guide and not as an absolute method of determining which sites should come for development, as a totting up approach of scoring greens, ambers and reds is too simplistic and potentially flawed . Paragraph 2.17 of the supporting text states that it is not the Council's intention to rank the sites, yet the remainder of the paragraph and the following paragraph 2.18 conversely suggest however, that ranking of sites is generally what the Council is intending to do There are a number of issues that need to be considered in the interpretation of the 'scoring system' and which mitigate against applying a simple scoring system. I set out examples below
1039	2	Weighting -Should all nine criteria be given considered equal weight?, or are some criteria more fundamental to the site selection? I would suggest for example that criteria 2 is more important than criteria 4, particularly as the Council are not generally looking at many 'strategic' scale sites of over 20 ha which is the threshold at which Defra is to be consulted on the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1039	3	The consideration of Constraints -The larger the site, and or the more complex the site in terms of its capacity for mixed use, the greater the prospect of potential development constraints being identified. Clearly, if significant constraints cannot be overcome then in many cases the site should not be developed. However, there will inevitably be large and/or mixed use sites delivering major sustainability benefits, which will have some constraints (albeit capable of resolution) that could result in the site being marked down to an amber rating, whilst other smaller (residential) sites which deliver less tangible community benefits, could secure a higher green rating
1039	4	Impacts on Water Source Protection Zones -potentially generates a conflict in that sites in the major (sustainable) settlements may well be scored amber or red, whilst sites in less sustainable locations may score green by virtue of not falling within an SPZ. Given that housing is not considered as a polluting activity, we would question the merit of including this criterion for housing assessments as it has the potential to downgrade sites unnecessarily on the basis of location within a graduated SPZ, whilst in reality having negligible impact thereon.
1039	5	In our opinion, there should be an additional 'local infrastructure' category which assesses sites in respect of their ability to support existing community facilities and infrastructure <i>for</i> physically deliver enhanced facilities as part of the site allocation. Criterion 3 is the only criteria which positively scores sites for delivering economic development yet there are wider considerations that should be taken into account when the suitability of a site is being assessed, such as the ability of a site to support local facilities or alternatively deliver facilities for which the local community has identified a specific need. For example the opportunity for a major site to deliver a primary school site, or a smaller rural site to deliver a local play area or school playing field extension are tangible and significant benefits that individual sites can deliver. Unfortunately this consideration falls outside the current range of assessment criteria used by BDC.
1039	6	Our request to the Council is to be pragmatic and look critically at all the benefits that a site has to offer and not to be too focused on the traffic light scoring system in the light of the comments made.
1039	7	On behalf of our clients, Omnivore Limited we are promoting a modest residential development of up to 30 dwellings on the site of the property and former horticultural nursery known as Canal Turn on the northern side of Welham Road on the north western edge of the Retford Site reference 6.
1039	8	The allocation of this landholding offers the District Council the opportunity to redraw the Retford Settlement Envelope along a clearly defensible Quitter boundary whereas the current envelope does not follow any demarcated boundary within the property. By pushing the settlement boundary out to the east as far as the canal, a clear physical demarcation is secured and the settlement boundary is then consistent with the south side of Welham Road where the canal clearly defines the physical north-west edge of the town
1039	9	The site owners have previously undertaken flood risk assessment and submitted this to the Council confirming that the site IS NOT at risk of fluvial flooding AND THIS HAS NOW BEEN RECOGNISED IN THE 2011 SHLAA. They have also confirmed an alternative option for access from Longholme Road which could secure a higher density of development than the lower density scheme that can be accessed directly from Welham Road.
1039	10	The site is located in a highly marketable and accessible area of Retford and on a main bus route into the town centre. This vacant, self contained and available site is well contained and landscaped, and development here would follow logical boundaries and have no adverse amenity or visual impact on the immediate surroundings.
1040	1	Destruction of agricultural land. My first concern at the possible development of this area is that this is agricultural land. Even the area which is now a golf course has not lost its value as agricultural land by its present use but will in fact be gaining value in that respect by being more or less fallow for so many years; its only crop being grass. The damage to the area's flora and fauna would be significant, not to mention the loss of amenities for the people of the town, i.e. the golf course and the countryside walks which are well used.
1040	2	Traffic. If the area shown was all to be developed there would be an enormous increase in traffic. Access to the area would most likely be concentrated on the Northern side i.e. Blyth Road as the southern side has the canal, railway and sewage works dividing it from Retford Road and the A57 bypass. This means that a link to the bypass would not be easy to provide either to the north or the south resulting in heavy traffic on the existing roads. Should industry be developed in this area it would cause an increase of traffic to the A1 with a potential detrimental effect on the village of Blyth.
1040	3	Services - Sewage treatment. Some of this development would of necessity be very close to the Sewage works, which would probably need to be enlarged. The proximity of a sewage treatment works to any development would not be ideal but especially not to a residential area. The site is, of necessity, low lying and any smells emanating from it rise, especially in warm weather, into the surrounding area. The air around Kilton can be malodorous at times even now; to have houses, shops, schools any closer would not be good. When land was developed for housing near to the Hallcroft sewage works in Retford many years ago it resulted in a great many complaints about the smell. It is a problem which is difficult if not impossible to solve.
1040	4	Water Supply. The water supply could not be supplied by gravity to the higher areas and at the moment I believe that the Kilton and Prospect area have their supply pumped from the Sunnyside Reservoir. Would this arrangement be adequate to cope with development of the proposed area? If not, will it be possible to increase the capacity of the present facility or would it be necessary for a new one to be built thus increasing the amount of land which has to be developed?
1040	5	Finance. Services to the development will be very expensive; is the cost to be met from increased council taxes?
1040	6	The need for housing cannot be denied but consideration must be given to the quality of life for the occupants of both new and existing houses
1041	1	I wish to object to the development of plot 35 my reasons are as follows. Any buildings on this site would be detrimental to the wildlife and flowers of the ancient woods casting a shadow and stopping dappled light getting through the trees.
1041	2	The public footpath and bridal way is used by hundreds of people (young and old) each week as a leisure facility and is extensively used by dog walkers, cyclists, horse riders bird watchers and ramblers from this area and further afield.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1041	3	This is prime Agricultural land for food production and in turn creates jobs for the area.
1041	4	The line of houses at the moment create the boundary line of Worksop, building on these fields would create an urban sprawl spilling into Carlton-in-Lindrick connecting a Town to a Village.
1041	5	The ratio of houses to green fields is just right and maturing nicely, any over development would ruin Gateford which at the moment is a very nice place to live, we all like it the way it is
1041	6	I have studied the map and see there are other plots that could be developed closer to town and within walking distance of the amenities easing up on road congestion and pollution.
1041	7	The road from the R/A would cut through a green area which is supposed to be potentially protected.
1042	1	I am writing to object to proposals for potential sites namely no.4 on the grounds that such huge building site will ruin the green spaces that we have had for generations.
1042	2	There would be loss of trees and hedgerows and the habitat of various wildlife.
1042	3	The density and mass of buildings will impact greatly on the visual amenities.
1042	4	Has a thought gone into the extra need for jobs, schools, health care, shops and leisure facilities.
1042	5	Also where will all the traffic to and from the site and future housing be accessed from - not to mention the carbon footprint aspect of it all.
1043	1	In response to your consultation meeting, I wish to make the following comments in respect of the possible development of the above mentioned area of land at Hemmingfield, Worksop. It is generally believed that when planning consent was granted for the development of Hemmingfield Close, Hemmingfield Rise, and Hemmingfield Way, a condition of planning was that the number of dwellings be restricted. The infrastructure was therefore carried out as detailed on planning approval, bearing in mind that this planning was granted some 30 years ago, therefore the number of vehicles using the highway was considerably less than in present times.
1043	2	Therefore to consider giving access into the proposed site from Hemmingfield Rise, is totally impractical and impossible without causing danger to all road users, and it is with respect that this should be referred to the Highways Planning Department. Should this site be given further consideration I would then point out that on leaving the proposed site, traffic would travel along Hemmingfield Rise, an extremely narrow road, with no possibility of increasing the width, then turn onto Hemmingfield Crescent, slightly wider but with considerably more traffic, with numerous vehicles parking on the roadway, particularly when families return from work, some properties have no alternative but to park on the roadway, already several incidents have taken place, emergency vehicles would find access very difficult if not impossible. At either end of Hemmingfield Crescent you have two bends both of which have limited visibility You would then turn onto Hemmingfield Road, the only road of any width and the only road which is covered by a bus service, once again owing to road conditions.
1043	3	In adverse weather conditions the bus service has been suspended, with residents having to leave vehicles at home and where possible make journeys on foot, therefore any new residents would only add to congestion.
1043	4	Should the site be given further consideration, I would with respect ask that thought be given to the type of dwellings, Hemmingfield development if primarily bungalows, failing this housing of low density could be a possibility. With the possibility of alternative access roads being considered, giving easier entry and exit from site, with less disruption for residents. Whilst most roads in the area suffer from congestion at sometime of day surely a solution could be found. Additional access roads could be made via Winster Grove/ Grange, onto the Dales development, or new road to link directly onto old Thievesdale Lane, or a new road giving direct access onto Carlton Road.
1044	1	The potential housing sites I would prefer to be developed are as follows: Site nos. 6, 27, 70, 488 & 489
1044	2	I have major concerns about the allocation of land south of Ordsall for future housing use, particularly sites numbered 1, 40,41,52,259 & 364, for the reasons set out below: ,
1044	3	Road access any additional houses in Ordsall will result in more cars in the area and more traffic on the roads. If existing residential roads in this part of Ordsall are taken, as a guide, one can expect there to be about one-and-a-half to two cars per household. To get into Retford town centre by car, residents of the above sites are likely to use Ordsall High Street, most of which is effectively a single lane road because of the amount of on-street parking, and then go over Ordsall Bridge onto Goosemoor Lane. Ordsall bridge is narrow, being scarcely wide enough for two cars to pass each other and has an inadequate, narrow pavement for pedestrians. When buses and lorries cross the bridge there are hold-ups for other traffic, which has to wait until the large vehicles have crossed the bridge. Additional housing in Ordsall would increase the traffic using this route and would lead to additional congestion in the High Street and at the bridge. : Development of the sites in Ordsall would be likely to lead to more traffic through Eaton, to get to the A638 and southwards from Retford. The single-width, hump-backed bridge with no pedestrian footpath would be inadequate for significantly increased traffic. Additional traffic through the village would be detrimental to the living environment of the residents of Eaton. Access to and from the north, to the A620 Babworth Road, is along West Hill Road and Ordsall Road, passing Ordsall Primary School. At the end of the school day there are always a considerable number of parked cars along West Hill Road, as parents are waiting to collect their children from school and a stretch of West Hill Road is effectively a single-width road for this time. For the reasons given above, the roads around Ordsall are simply not suitable for a significantly increased number of cars in the area, which would inevitably lead to heavier traffic on the roads and more congestion at peak times.
1044	4	The main route into Retford from the south is along the A638 London Road and if houses were built on sites 1, 52 and 40, which are slightly elevated sites, these would be visible from that road. New housing on these sites would detract from the character of this side of Retford and would constitute further urban sprawl ; into open countryside
1044	5	The proposed sites are home to a wide variety of wildlife, including some endangered species. Development would be likely adversely to affect available habitat for various species including skylarks, barn owls, hawks, kestrels, bats, foxes, hedgehogs and various insects. Development would lead to the loss of some trees and hedgerows which are a valuable habitat for a variety of species.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1044	6	The sites are used by, for example, walkers, runners, children playing and dog walkers and there are a number of public footpaths over the sites. Visitors to the : area as well as residents enjoy views over open countryside which would be lost if houses were built on the proposed sites. The sites are greenfield agricultural land which has been un-built on since time immemorial and would be lost forever if development were allowed to take place.
1044	7	For the reasons explained above, it is considered that the proposed sites to the ' south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1044	8	From the map of Retford in the <i>Bassetlaw Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultations Paper</i> , I am surprised to see that the land bounded by the Water Works, Jubilee Road, Harewood Avenue and the railway line (1/70, 1/13 and : 1/72) is designated as Potential Protected Open Space. As this land is entirely surrounded by building and development of one sort or another, it would be a · more appropriate site for residential development than the virgin greenfield sites south of Ordsall. I would estimate that up to about 150 houses could be · built on this site. Future access to this land appears to have been · deliberately made available from the end of Silver Street when Jubilee Road was , developed in the late 1930's -there is a gap between the houses on the south side of Jubilee Road which would allow a road to be built into site 1/70
1045	1	Areas 3, 370 & 570 are flood zones. This land has flooded in the past which caused untold problems throughout Retford -why would you build on land that floods?
1045	2	Primary School capacity. Bracken Lane Primary School is already running at full capacity where would all the extra children go?
1045	3	Congestion. Grove Coach Road & Bracken Lane are unfit for any extra traffic, the queues to join London Road, regularly go back to Rose Avenue, more houses, mean yet more traffic
1045	4	Inadequate infrastructure. The area just can't take any more traffic
1045	5	Road Safety -London Road/Bracken Lane and London Road/Grove Coach Road junctions
1045	6	More traffic would mean more accidents.
1045	7	Loss of hedgerows - The mature hedges around the above areas are a haven to wildlife., where will they go if the hedges are chopped down
1046	1	Is area 69 common land? If so, are the council allowed to develop common land which is for use by all local residents and is in close proximity to known and very well-used public footpaths. Could the council please explain whether the areas of proposed development are potential areas identified by the council themselves or whether they have been approached by individual owners of the land requesting development rights? In addition, with regards to area 69 which is the area of most concern to ourselves, I am fully aware that the owner of the Hop Pole Public House, recently requested planning permission for a marina on part of that site and this was refused; surely this would have created employment, attracted cash-bringing visitors to the Retford area and would undoubtedly have been an attractive addition to the immediate vicinity and should not have had a particularly adverse impact on local wildlife/fauna. Why that was then turned down? Was it that the council range the proposals down in order to 'push through' instead a housing development
1046	2	Moreover, if area 69 is selected and developed, a further concern is that planning would d then be requested for the fields to the south and east of Habergham Cottage, thus adding further to the impact on the wildlife/fauna, loss of green areas of Retford and further loss of privacy to ourselves.
1046	3	Areas 6, 7 and 69 are all within flood zones 2. When we enquired with the Planning Department at Bassetlaw District Council whilst considering our purchase of Habergham Cottage (just over two years ago), we were informed that development to the rear or either side of our property would be extremely unlikely ever to be allowed due to the fact that the whole area is on a flood plain. I am sure you will now understand our disappointment and concern then that planning is being considered for this area; certainly our property has suffered from flood related problems and I am certain that any new properties built on the area would also be likely to do so also. The map on Bassetlaw District Council's own website confirms that the areas 6, 7 and 69 are all within known flood zones.
1046	4	Area 69 land is clay based with heavy water saturation during heavy prolonged rain and/or snow.
1046	5	Area 69 has been empty for many years as a pseudo nature reserve, with the following wildlife seen hunting off the land: Owls (including Barn owls), hawks and foxes. There are also bats flying in the area. Where do these nest and would any development on site 69 affect the wildlife? Has any survey been undertaken in relation to wildlife and fauna on the site? Bats are of course, a protected species and it is possible their roosting places are on the land under consideration for proposed development. I would suggest that a survey would need to be undertaken prior to developments as it is a criminal offence to intentionally or recklessly disturb such roosting places. In any case, there is clearly a danger of the destruction of local ecological habitats.
1046	6	As part of area 69 runs along the Chesterfield canal what would the impact on the canal wildlife be? What would also be the impact on the cleanliness of the canal?
1046	7	The land level for area 69 is below road level and runs along the chesterfield canal. Main drainage would require pumping to road level or all houses would require septic tanks as we have. What effects would a pumping station or 114 tanks have on the environment?
1046	8	The average number of people per house is around 2.3 , the average number of cars per house hold is expected to be close to 3. With the possibilities of a total of 458 cars per day entering or exiting Welham Road, which is a major artery to Gainsborough and beyond, what will be done to ease congestion and make it safe for so many cars, as at present there are two entries to the road, one of which is on a sharp incline?
1046	9	During rush hour the A638 Arlington Way is heavily congested both ways, another 228 cars using the road will cause further congestion and pollution. Furthermore, with a proposal of in excess of 3000 houses proposed for the Retford area what will be done on entry and egress for traffic using the A638 and A620?
1046	10	On a personal note, Habergham Cottage at present is only partly overlooked by the Hop pole public house some 150 yds. away. This only has a balcony, three upper and lower windows potentially overlooking our house Our property has been designed for outdoor living with a swimming pool and hot tub. The build of so many properties would dramatically impact on our privacy and use of outdoor space. We would potentially be heavily overlooked with the resultant loss of privacy that would follow.

Reference number		Answer
Responde nt	Comme nt	
1046	11	Also as our house is just off due south, so many houses to our south west would affect the amount of light to the property. As previously mentioned, the house already suffers with the effects of land drainage from the field to our south and east, which during bad weather causes surface water to run under our property. At present area 69 is an undeveloped and so surface water run on to it from the field to our east and south. By placing dwellings on the land I would argue it would affect the land drainage from said field which would then force more surface water on to our property. We would be seeking assurances from the Council that any increased water issues with our property would be assessed and put right I am sure there would be other concerns apparent in due course but unfortunately we have only found out about the early stage proposals a week ago through a local resident; I would just like to point out that at no point have we received any form of notification, or questionnaire and have clearly now missed the meeting on the 31 St January. I do appreciate that the investigations are at an early stage but I do feel that consultation with residents is vital for them to be reassured and to have their legitimate questions and concerns raised and addressed.
1047	1	Question 1 -Screening Methodology -this is very difficult for the 'layman' to understand and comment upon, but I feel that some sites which may be suitable / preferable have been screened out for the wrong reasons e.g. not currently for sale, and yet this is a plan for the next 20 years!
1047	2	However, I fully agree with criterion 1 regarding public opinion. This should be given the highest priority and only in exceptional circumstances should development take place against the wishes of the local population
1047	3	Question 9 -The allocation of more housing in the town should be controlled and ~based upon local public support and need, not greed of the developers
1047	4	Question 10 -Development should take place on brown field sites and not green field sites. There is plenty of small in-fill which could take place within the town area of Retford which would go a long way to meeting the target number of increased housing. For example apartments in the canal side warehouse (Discount Cycles) which would greatly enhance the area and raise few objections. Also the King Edward School site, St Alban's Church site, the building once used as the Working Men's Club and the new privately owned car park opposite the Little Theatre, could all be developed with little objection, lots of public support and greatly enhance the town centre.
1047	5	Moving to the periphery of the Retford area is the Bramcote Lawn school site. This has good local access as well as access to the A 1 and to Retford and would not encroach on the local village of Gamston, as it is a distance away. The newly built Gamston primary school appears to have room for expansion and the nearby secondary school of Tuxford could be reached with ease as there are already transport links in place. A significant number of properties could be accommodated on this site
1047	6	Question 14 -The open spaces identified should be protected and more should be added to this list, including the agricultural land listed as sites 489, 488, 511 , 370 and 3. Question 15 -Sites 489, 488, 511 , 370 and 3 should definitely NOT be developed for the following reasons
1047	7	No public support -'fundamental'
1047	8	2. Flood risk -this land has flooded frequently over recent years and building on it will merely make this problem worse.
1047	9	Local road access problems -Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road are already very busy roads with issues regarding parking and exiting out onto London Road and any development of these sites can only make this problem worse.
1047	10	Any development on these sites will impact negatively on the local landscape's character. The sites mentioned above are all classed as "conserve" in the Bassetlaw Landscape Assessment. Therefore, development should not take place (criterion 6).
1047	11	Under Criterion 8 any development will significantly detract from the existing green infrastructure of this area. These fields with their trees, hedgerows and ditches are a haven for wildlife -newts, toads, frogs, water voles etc. All of this will be lost if development takes place here due to the loss of trees, hedgerows, ecological habitats and landscape
1047	12	Question 121 -If the local people are happy and the Travelling community is happy, then perhaps it is better to concentrate development around existing traveller sites.
1047	13	Question 153 -A few years ago a very tidy and well maintained Traveller site was set up next to the A 1 south of Elkesley at the junction with the Walesby / Ollerton Road. This must have been an unofficial site, as it disappeared after a while, but it was in a position which did not seem to create any problems. I hope that you will find my comments and suggestions useful. You will note that whilst I have put a case forward for not building on certain suggested sites, I have also made some further suggestions for sites that may be more suitable / appropriate for development.
1048	1	The wildlife in the area including deer, snakes, owls and I have been informed dormice would be adversely affected.
1048	2	The present road structure is insufficient and the increased traffic on Tiln Lane would be unacceptable and a danger to life.
1048	3	The entire character of the area would be destroyed.
1048	4	While I appreciate land needs to be put aside for development I feel that the land to the N W of Retford i.e. plots 51 and 58 would be a better choice as this has better access to main roads and A1
1048	5	This would not destroy character of area as new housing already there, also it includes development land.
1049	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
1049	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
1049	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1049	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area.
1049	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
1049	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
1049	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical.
1049	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
1049	9	The Gateford housing estate at present boasts more than one thousand properties. It works well, is mature and suits the residents and local area well. An extension to this site as proposed would result in a great loss of amenity for local residents and have a detrimental effect which would change the character of the entire area.
1050	1	Yes
1050	2	No
1050	3	Areas 06,07,37,46,69,46,309 and 533 in the Tiln Lane Area
1050	4	Areas 01,40,41,52 and 364 in Ordsall
1050	5	The reason behind the aforementioned is [a] Environmentally the areas 03,370,488,489 and 511 are, in the majority of cases, subject to flooding and spend considerable periods of time under water;
1050	6	The infrastructure for existing drainage, sewage and transport is already at maximum capacity
1050	7	Additional pressure on residents living close to Bracken Lane School during pupils arriving lunchtime and leaving periods. Children's safety must also be a concern with any increase in level of road traffic
1050	8	The ecology in the area will be decimated. There is a significant number of rare birds, wild fowl insects and animals whose habitat will be destroyed and final
1050	9	the vast majority of the land around the Bracken Lane area I believe is on existing flood plains. We all noticed the folly and disastrous consequences of undertaking building development projects in other parts of the country in the recent past. As far as I am aware the other areas I have noted will have their own inherent issues, I am sure they will not have the serious effects that apply to the Broken Lane area.
1050	10	Please refer to my comments noted in question 10
1050	11	Having been a resident in the Bracken Lane area for over thirty years the proposed sites have predominantly been under water. They have been referred to colloquially as the "swampiest". It is an apt title and clearly illustrates the dangers of allowing development in that area. I am sure other areas previously mentioned would be far more appropriate areas to meet the needs of the local community.
1051	1	The method appears flawed as it identifies "infill" sites (i.e. building in gardens) as part of the plan where as these sites are for separate consideration.
1051	2	The amount of housing and employment allocated is in excess of what is needed. There are plenty of vacant properties (domestic and commercial) already in Worksop area. The new developments planned on Vesuvius/Kilton sites will provide ample employment opportunities
1051	3	Small infill sites (218, 151) or to the edges of existing sites (35) would be preferable. These areas already have the infrastructure in place to cope with a greater number of houses. The Monks Way development in Shireoaks has not integrated with the existing community and roads still not adopted by the council.
1051	4	W1 is a greenfield site and with alternative brown field sites should not be used.
1051	5	W13 is next to the canal (green corridor) and development would have to be carefully controlled
1051	6	W12 has existing infrastructure and transport links.
1051	7	W9 is the best site for mixed use development. It has existing links with A1 via 2 accesses and therefore minimising impact on road links in the town. Other sites would require crossing the town to have such access.
1051	8	All identified open spaces should be protected. in addition the site around Shireoaks marina 153 & 587 should be included in this category.
1051	9	Development should be limited so as to preserve the identity of villages like Shireoaks and Rhodesia and not allow them to be engulfed by Worksop.
1051	10	153/587 is a unique area within the county and possibly with the country and as such it should be preserved and enhanced by the council. The Chesterfield canal provides a corridor through this area and as such is a gateway for tourists. The area needs to present Worksop at its best not deter visitors from the rest of the local area.
1052	1	Fundamentally in agreement
1052	2	However greater emphasis should be placed on the economic and financial vitality of the village so as to support services and facilities.
1052	3	Development should be on sites where space can be provided, so a lesser density and avoid infill and hence intensification of building.
1052	4	Option A
1052	5	14 houses over the period is inadequate, if assuming this is total, not houses per year, 10- 15 per year is a more realistic proposal. The feed back also refers to provision of other facilities or improvements- these could only be funded by a larger scale development.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1052	6	224. it combines proximity to the built environment, low intrusion into countryside, accessibility, space to provide the housing and facilities sought and is available in either tranches or as a whole.
1052	7	Sites 157 and 537 are outside the natural boundaries of the village
1052	8	156 and 516 are infill and intensification
1052	9	234 is an extension into open countryside away from existing buildings
1053	1	Option A
1053	2	No I do not agree that land should be allocated for at least nine new houses. I think that development should be restricted to a maximum of nine houses and these should include infill already agreed. Further development of the village would spoil its character and put additional strain on the existing somewhat infrastructure.
1053	3	I don't think any of the indicated sites should be developed.
1053	4	There are issues with the infrastructure especially electrical supply and main drains that need to be addressed for existing houses. Noise levels from the A1 are a major nuisance.
1053	5	All existing green spaces - the village green, church green, cricket field and school playing field - should be protected from future development.
1053	6	I think that any new gypsy and traveller sites should be concentrated in and around existing sites because there is adequate space for expansion of these sites. Expanding existing sites would be cheaper for tax payers than creating new sites.
1053	7	Transit and residential pitches should be provided together to minimise cost for tax payers.
1054	1	Yes.
1054	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Haworth Bircotes?
1054	3	Yes we agree that there should be at least 5 new homes in Gamston.
1054	4	Site 410.
1054	5	Yes the school should be protected.
1054	6	Yes his site should be developed before any other as it is a brownfield site.
1055	1	Yes
1055	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1055	3	No, we disagree. Gringley has seen enough new housing over the past few years. Many homes are still empty and for sale.
1055	4	No sites
1055	5	Yes, we agree.
1055	6	Existing sites where there are facilities.
1055	7	Separately as cultures may not mix
1056	1	Yes
1056	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1056	3	No, it is a local village for local people.
1056	4	None of the above sites.
1056	5	Yes, the village green is very important to the village.
1056	6	Existing sites
1056	7	Separately
1057	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1057	2	Yes, because six is a reasonable amount over 18 years.
1057	3	sites 101 and 107
1057	4	This should be protected as a public house.
1057	5	The spinney and village green should be protected.
1058	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1058	2	No, the village cannot have anymore housing due to the large development at the detention centre site. This development is still not completed.
1058	3	The two sites shown are not suitable for housing due to the conservation restrictions.
1058	4	Too much housing already.
1058	5	The village sports ground needs to be protected from development.
1059	1	No - the Sutton cum Lound Parish Plan published in 2010 clearly states that there is no support for any form of development within the village boundary
1059	2	None
1059	3	We are aware that there are existing planning applications within the village which must already fulfil the requirements for new housing without any further developments

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1059	4	Yes
1059	5	Any new traveller sites should be concentrated around existing sites as these are already established
1059	6	These pitches should be kept together on established sites and to respect the travellers culture by keeping them together and not forcing them apart
1059	7	No
1059	8	Option B: Focused in just one of the above towns?
1060	1	On the whole yes, but i think a wider area should be looked at
1060	2	No: half the amount, where is the new employment for locals?
1060	3	30,35&90 these would be best in my opinion,
1060	4	W13 W1 W12 W8
1060	5	195 348
1060	6	Yes, imagine 40 yrs. down the line if it was lost
1060	7	You have highlighted a good deal be aware though that all could change and you need to be able to change with it.
1060	8	No 8 should stay Open space. Too near A60 drainage, local road congested now as previously said Schools medical including hospital Blues and twos. Remove quiet area from all residents young and old alike. I think it would up set the local eco and environmental status.
1060	9	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1060	10	emotive area not in my back yard but a controlled area with correct and adequate policing
1060	11	together as a watching brief is best
1060	12	I don't know the area well enough to comment
1061	1	The attempt to take into account the range of criteria is sound
1061	2	but must, to gain credibility - and avoid waste - be based on realistic economic development estimates for the town. I may have missed it, but didn't see any reference to Worksop as a dormitory area for Sheffield and Doncaster.
1061	3	Increasing employment in the area should be a basic underpinning. What kind of employment needs very realistic discussion and I would doubt that a major increase of professional-type, detached housing would be the highest priority. If more social and flexible housing is appropriate it would best be developed near as possible to work sites.
1061	4	Site 4/W9 which is as yet undeveloped gives the greatest opportunity for appropriate development of variety of housing and services. As developed below, I think area 35 unsuitable.
1061	5	those coloured purple seem appropriate. Wherever possible brown field sites should be considered
1061	6	Site 35 should be retained for single use in conformity with point 2.27 compatibility criteria.
1061	7	All the open spaces should be protected and should be enlarged by a decision to remove area 35 from the major development implied.
1061	8	If any is thought appropriate, it should be small-scale and limited to a small amount of similar type housing and density as already exists, and limited to the east of the proposed area. This would avoid changing the character of the area and would avoid disturbing a major amenity for the town in bridle paths, ancient trees, hedgerows and woodland which are regularly used by ramblers and horse riders.
1061	9	In addition, the already high level of housing in the contiguous area already leads to traffic congestion on estate roads and such major arteries as Ashes Park Avenue, creating some danger to children and disabled chair and motor buggy users from the care home.
1061	10	Extension of Area 35 on a massive scale would ruin the kind of Worksop suburb, that the Council tried successfully to create in the new residential area at Gateford as well as creating for itself major problems about extension of school, medical and leisure facilities as well as infrastructure.
1061	11	The preservation of the important environmental area round Worksop is vital or it will become little more than an extension of the crowded town central region and will play no part in attracting either tourists or residents to live and work there. This applies equally to 4/W9, but the problem is not as intense as in 35 as a planned development could take place, rather than tacking development on to an existing planned and settled community
1061	12	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1061	13	not familiar with the existing situation. Such sites are necessary but should be chosen with great care.
1062	1	I think that location 35 is unsuitable. I am a registered child minder and over the eight years I have been doing so, the children and myself have benefited from the wonderful environment located at location 35, we have been able to watch the farmers growing crops and the children have become aware of many area of nature not only on the fields but in the surround woodland.
1062	2	I consider that the wildlife would be disturbed or killed by such developments and I consider the loss of this would be detrimental to entire estate.
1062	3	Also I contemplate as to the provision of new schooling, as gatefold park is already at its max.
1062	4	The traffic would be unbearable and we already have problems accessing gatefold rd. from the estate without a possible 700-1400 more cars leaving at peak times!!
1062	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1063	1	I would prefer to see the development more scattered across the district and not focused purely on giant estates.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1063	2	I believe open sites are a valuable asset and that development should be avoided on these sites. They provide play space and recreational space. They provide pockets of land where wildlife can flourish and plants can grow creating havens for people with limited or no garden space. I believe this can really enhance the appearance of towns and districts.
1063	3	My main concern regarding the proposals is the effect of increased traffic. In particular site 35 where I currently live. With a potential 700 new houses all potentially with one or two vehicles it could become very difficult to leave the estate at peak times. Both exits to the estate (Gateford Rd and Carlton Rd) only have one lane and traffic already backs up.
1063	4	As a resident of the estate for 11 years we have been in situations before where school spaces have been insufficient and this is likely to recur. The current secondary school provision is also likely to be inadequate with the proposed scale of development.
1063	5	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1063	6	I don't have particular views on locations but strongly believe that better amenities should be provided for this population.
1064	1	I think that location 35 is unsuitable.
1064	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1065	1	NO - Shireoaks would be part of an urban sprawl from Worksop.
1065	2	195/W8: Land at Shireoaks Common should not be developed as the open space keeps Shireoaks from being part of the urban sprawl of Worksop.
1065	3	1. There would need to develop the infrastructure to cope with the amount of housing proposed. St Luke's Primary School would need to be extended for the number of pupils. Access to Monks Way at dropping off and pick-up times is already chaotic and dangerous, a larger school would make it impossible to access our own homes at these times of day. Access for emergency vehicles would be impossible and we have already seen a death in the school car park where the emergency services were unable to get quick access.
1065	4	2. The development of the above site would add to the urban sprawl of Worksop and in fact Shireoaks would lose its separate identity and become part of Worksop. The very nature of the village would be changed.
1065	5	3. The employment land would lead to extra lorry journeys around the village and the roads will be unable to cope with this.
1065	6	I would like the council to consider developing the land on the old Vesuvius site.
1065	7	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1065	8	Existing sites
1066	1	My opinion is that location 35 is an unsuitable site for development. If development goes ahead it will be a great loss of a much utilised amenity.
1066	2	The increase in traffic will lead to more congestion and pollution.
1066	3	The density of housing will be too great for the local infrastructure to support which will lead to even more development.
1066	4	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1067	1	New development and housing is always welcome, however the location of the same needs to be carefully considered.
1067	2	Sites should be on infill/brownfield sites and certainly not on greenfield sites in and around Shireoaks.
1067	3	This is an important part of Bassetlaw where people escape to in order to enjoy the countryside.
1067	4	Under no circumstances should any development be built on or near Shireoaks common or near the canal.
1067	5	REMOVED
1067	6	As question 3 - Away from areas used for recreation and escapism around Shireoaks. People come from a far to enjoy the canal and adjoining countryside, this alone brings provides jobs and opportunities for local people.
1067	7	Mixed used sites should not be used. Commercial sites need to stay close to the A57 but away from greenfield sites.
1067	8	Open space should always be protected. It provides a free escape from the madness of every day life.
1067	9	Protect Shireoaks common and the area around the canal.
1067	10	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1067	11	They should be concentrated in existing sites, no new sites on virgin land should be provided, especially if that land is anywhere near open countryside.
1067	12	REMOVED
1067	13	Retford
1068	1	Cannot find the screening methodology on your site, this is making an informed opinion almost impossible.
1068	2	Worksop already has a surplus of housing, sales are slow and the future is not very bright, new empty houses do no good for the district. I don't see the point of pushing estates to the limit and beyond when there are large swathes of land available elsewhere in the district with better road access
1068	3	The large mixed use site near to the golf course (cannot open your maps so don't know the plan number) would serve Worksop better than all the others
1068	4	Employment sites should be nearer to existing employment areas, the public transport infrastructure is totally inadequate at present and to spread these areas further would force more people to use private cars increasing pollution and traffic noise
1068	5	The large mixed use site near to the golf course (cannot open your maps so don't know the plan number) would serve Worksop better than all the others

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1068	6	The indicated sites should be protected, more use of land separating developments should also be protected and large estates should have a minimum of 500 meters separating them to maintain the semi-rural aspects of the area.
1068	7	Every day I see people using the open spaces for dog walking, jogging, playing with children etc., the land is currently well used; this shows how valuable it is to the local community and as such should be protected.
1068	8	The area 35 on the map, Gateford the area is currently unable to support additional housing as the infrastructure is already crumbling under the strain of traffic and people living in the area. additional housing will give rise to more and more cars making the streets less safe for our children, Ashes Park Avenue is already a bottleneck in the mornings and evenings, car entering Gateford road take risks as it is a very busy junction, many days cars already have a long wait to exit A.P.A to G.R. longer waits will lead to increased rick taking. If houses have to be built an alternative access road would be the safest option leading onto Owday Lane thus keeping traffic off Ashes Park Avenue
1068	9	I do not agree, if I am reading correctly you seem to have made an awful lot from 15 respondents, why was a larger audience not consulted? This was one of the best kept secrets around. Not enough thought or consultation has taken place. Why where questionnaires delivered to houses in small villages (300 to 650) but given out in an obscure way for Worksop
1068	10	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1068	11	I believe the existing sites are better suited to new plots, overall they will be better integrated into the existing neighbourhood, will cause fewer problems from local residents.
1069	1	Cannot find the screening methodology on your site, this is making an informed opinion almost impossible.
1069	2	Worksop already has a surplus of housing, sales are slow and the future is not very bright, new empty houses do no good for the district. I don't see the point of pushing estates to the limit and beyond when there are large swathes of land available elsewhere in the district with better road access
1069	3	The large mixed use site near to the golf course (cannot open your maps so don't know the plan number) would serve Worksop better than all the others
1069	4	Employment sites should be nearer to existing employment areas, the public transport infrastructure is totally inadequate at present and to spread these areas further would force more people to use private cars increasing pollution and traffic noise
1069	5	The large mixed use site near to the golf course (cannot open your maps so don't know the plan number) would serve Worksop better than all the others
1069	6	The indicated sites should be protected, more use of land separating developments should also be protected and large estates should have a minimum of 500 meters separating them to maintain the semi-rural aspects of the area.
1069	7	Every day I see people using the open spaces for dog walking, jogging, playing with children etc., the land is currently well used; this shows how valuable it is to the local community and as such should be protected.
1069	8	The area 35 on the map, Gateford the area is currently unable to support additional housing as the infrastructure is already crumbling under the strain of traffic and people living in the area. additional housing will give rise to more and more cars making the streets less safe for our children, Ashes Park Avenue is already a bottleneck in the mornings and evenings, car entering Gateford road take risks as it is a very busy junction, many days cars already have a long wait to exit A.P.A to G.R. longer waits will lead to increased rick taking. If houses have to be built an alternative access road would be the safest option leading onto Owday Lane thus keeping traffic off Ashes Park Avenue
1069	9	I do not agree, if I am reading correctly you seem to have made an awful lot from 15 respondents, why was a larger audience not consulted? This was one of the best kept secrets around. Not enough thought or consultation has taken place. Why where questionnaires delivered to houses in small villages (300 to 650) but given out in an obscure way for Worksop
1069	10	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1069	11	I believe the existing sites are better suited to new plots, overall they will be better integrated into the existing neighbourhood, will cause fewer problems from local residents.
1070	1	Cannot find the screening methodology on your site, this is making an informed opinion almost impossible.
1070	2	Worksop already has a surplus of housing, sales are slow and the future is not very bright, new empty houses do no good for the district. I don't see the point of pushing estates to the limit and beyond when there are large swathes of land available elsewhere in the district with better road access
1070	3	The large mixed use site near to the golf course (cannot open your maps so don't know the plan number) would serve Worksop better than all the others
1070	4	Employment sites should be nearer to existing employment areas, the public transport infrastructure is totally inadequate at present and to spread these areas further would force more people to use private cars increasing pollution and traffic noise
1070	5	The large mixed use site near to the golf course (cannot open your maps so don't know the plan number) would serve Worksop better than all the others
1070	6	The indicated sites should be protected, more use of land separating developments should also be protected and large estates should have a minimum of 500 meters separating them to maintain the semi-rural aspects of the area.
1070	7	Every day I see people using the open spaces for dog walking, jogging, playing with children etc., the land is currently well used; this shows how valuable it is to the local community and as such should be protected.
1070	8	The area 35 on the map, Gateford the area is currently unable to support additional housing as the infrastructure is already crumbling under the strain of traffic and people living in the area. additional housing will give rise to more and more cars making the streets less safe for our children, Ashes Park Avenue is already a bottleneck in the mornings and evenings, car entering Gateford road take risks as it is a very busy junction, many days cars already have a long wait to exit A.P.A to G.R. longer waits will lead to increased rick taking. If houses have to be built an alternative access road would be the safest option leading onto Owday Lane thus keeping traffic off Ashes Park Avenue

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1070	9	I do not agree, if I am reading correctly you seem to have made an awful lot from 15 respondents, why was a larger audience not consulted? This was one of the best kept secrets around. Not enough thought or consultation has taken place. Why where questionnaires delivered to houses in small villages (300 to 650) but given out in an obscure way for Worksop
1070	10	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1070	11	I believe the existing sites are better suited to new plots, overall they will be better integrated into the existing neighbourhood, will cause fewer problems from local residents.
1071	1	Yes. As long as existing "out-dated" "inefficient" housing estates are reviewed for additional space.
1071	2	I would like to see an increase in housing, but not in wholesale estates, more as bespoke developments. In my opinion Worksop needs the right kind of housing, not just huge housing estates.
1071	3	Site 4/W9: Land east of Worksop - Option 1. The land is not immediately overlooked yet will provide residents the open space of the golf course. There is also options of direct access to both Retford Road and Blyth Road.
1071	4	The smaller allocations alongside the A57 such as 26,45,371 provide a high combined housing number but without adding to already overstretched infrastructure.
1071	5	W1 & w12. To put more employment - presumably trading estates in places already close to housing, will only increase traffic congestion and traffic around schools etc. These two sites are away from housing and also provide good links to the A1.
1071	6	Site 4/W9: Land east of Worksop - Option 1.
1071	7	Yes - and more sites such as those around Gateford. Gateford is a well established area now, with a good socio economic balance. To disturb this balance, in my opinion the high income residents will simply leave Worksop.
1071	8	Much more emphasis needs to be placed on Green spaces around existing housing. This space needs protecting, not only for obvious "Green" reasons but also because these spaces are what people use, free of charge, without driving, exercising in and around. These are benefits of living in Bassetlaw. If these benefits are removed and it becomes an urban sprawl of faceless housing estates, then the added strain on the infrastructure and removal of these benefits and attractions will simply mean people leave the area
1071	9	preferred sites from those nominated are Site 4/W9 and also the smaller bespoke spaces. These smaller builds will cause much less impact on the existing infrastructure than adding hundreds of homes where they cannot be accommodated.
1071	10	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1071	11	Yes they should expand existing sites where possible to minimise the impact to those opposed to these sites.
1071	12	It depends on the space and the surroundings. If there is vast expanses of space, then yes, but of not they should be broken up to cause minimal impact to existing residents, who pay their council taxes.
1071	13	no.
1072	1	No. Believe you have made this form as vague as possible to allow you to reach the decisions you want. We live in Shireoaks and believe any of your suggests would damage the village atmosphere and community spirit we currently have.
1072	2	possibly a housing development. however, the roads cannot cope with the traffic currently using them and to extend would have to cut in to woodland and greenery which comes back to spoiling the village and would destroy the community
1072	3	9 and 35
1072	4	4 and W9
1072	5	Only housing
1072	6	All open space should be protected against any more building.
1072	7	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1072	8	If you have to increase then expand existing sites but maybe its time to say no more. Traveller sites should definitely not be brought into a village whose habitants are largely elderly people, many of which have lived in Shireoaks all their lives. It has to be recognised that elderly can feel threatened and intimidated by these people and the way they chose to live.
1072	9	Together
1073	1	Avoid greenbelt. Plenty of brownfield sites. Rejuvenate downbeat areas.
1073	2	Only if it is proven that there is growth in population. Similar situation is happening with Dinnington and there is no proof of growth. The housing is being built to meet Sheffield's immigration needs. Not sure if this is for similar reasons.
1073	3	Location 35 in Gateford is unsuitable. This is Green belt land and should never be available for selection.
1073	4	Brownfield sites get number one priority and there should be plenty of these. Rotherham council are facing the same issues with Dinnington and if greenbelt is built on then Woodsetts and Dinnington will become the same with urban sprawl.
1073	5	Risk of flooding and there is mention of this in the document for plot 35.
1073	6	Location 35 in Gateford to be protected greenbelt.
1073	7	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1074	1	yes

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1074	2	There is a need for more rewarding jobs for the people who already live in and around the town
1074	3	Shireoaks marina
1074	4	Ex Vesuvius and Dormer sites
1074	5	Ex Vesuvius site any development is better than how it is at present
1074	6	The ex Vesuvius site leads itself to multi functional use i.e. leisure, housing and office sites such as call centres
1074	7	Yes very much so
1074	8	Shireoaks badly needs parking facilities for the railway station people coming from Gateford to pick people coming off the trains is a big issue at peak times. Also the line through Shireoaks is in desperate need of some better trains can Bassetlaw not do something
1074	9	Yes
1074	10	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1075	1	yes
1075	2	no , adequate provision has already been made ,houses and industrial land/ buildings are empty at the moment .
1075	3	40. 52. 1
1075	4	259 plus r2
1075	5	259
1075	6	I would oppose the development of site 69 as it is already an SSSI having been left to vegetate over a considerable number of years it is low lying and tends to flood also the adjacent land also floods and spreads onto this land.
1075	7	The access and egress is at a point which is dangerous in that it is concealed from both ends of the main road
1075	8	The land itself has numerous species on the endangered list including a prolific number of water voles inhabiting the canal bank area, barn owls that nest in the area and use it as a hunting ground
1075	9	Yes
1075	10	Option A
1075	11	Existing sites
1075	12	Separate
1075	13	No
1076	1	In addition to the employment land shown, the Allocations document should formally recognise the potential contribution of Explore Industrial Park to the local economy by allocating for employment development. Planning permission was granted in December 2007 for Phase I of the Explore Industrial Park, which comprised the development of a state-of-the-art pre-cast concrete manufacturing facility and new access road onto the A619. Phase I has been completed and is now operational. This facility manufactures a range of products including walls, floors, columns and beams for construction projects throughout the UK and has already generated 270 jobs. Outline planning permission was then granted in April 2010 for the remaining phases. This allowed the creation of just over 82,000 m2 of floorspace on just over 27 ha of further development plots for a range of mainly B1, B2 and B8 industrial uses. However the Bassetlaw Employment Land Capacity Study (January 2010), which pre-dated the outline permission, assessed the suitability of this site for meeting future employment development needs, and considered the site to be of poor quality and as such the site has not been considered in the Site Allocation Issues & Options Consultation Paper. We challenge the results of this assessment. Firstly the system used to rank the sites as ‘good’, ‘average’ and ‘poor’ quality is very subjective and a small change in score can significantly change a site’s ranking. For example Explore Industrial Park (W3) scored a total of 21 and was ranked as ‘poor quality’, yet Land East of Blyth Road (W9), which scored 23 was ranked as ‘average quality’ and has been allocated as a potential mixed use site in this consultation paper. The study acknowledges at paragraph 7.4 that the rankings and categorisations are purely indicative to provide an estimation of the overall quality of the potential supply of sites. Since January 2010, the situation at Explore Industrial Park has changed and there are now a number of factors which would now raise the score of site W3 and change the categorisation of the site:
1076	2	Since the Employment Land Capacity Study was published, outline planning permission has been granted for the comprehensive development of the site, and as part of this a number of strategic highway improvements are proposed at the following locations: M1 Junction 30, A619/A616/Slayley Lane, A619/Clowne Road/ Church Street, A618/A619, A57/A60/B6024/St Annes Drive and A57/A60/High Grounds Way. The site is accessible to the M1, A1 and A57 – a factor which helped attract Laing O’Rourke to the site – and the site should now score higher in terms of strategic access.
1076	3	The masterplan permission, granted since the Study was completed, included measures to improve access to the site by public transport, including the provision of bus services. Local access to the site has therefore improved and the score should be increased for this criterion.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Response number	Comment	
1076	4	This criteria only scored 1 out of 5 at the time of the Study, however since this time the masterplan permission has been approved and, as discussed above, this permission requires public transport improvements which would change this criteria score.
1076	5	The masterplan also includes the provision of dedicated cycle routes within the site and along the site access road. Furthermore, appropriate changing rooms and locker facilities will be provided to encourage staff to cycle to the site.
1076	6	It is important to note that the site scored 5 out of 5 for compatibility with neighbouring land.
1076	7	Since the Study was published the Phase 1 Development has been completed and is now operating. The facility now manufactures a range of products including walls, floors, columns and beams for their projects throughout the UK. In respect of contamination, the approved masterplan requires further remediation works across the site which is currently being progressed and is due to be completed later in 2012.
1076	8	We challenge the comments on the site's market attractiveness. Alongside the Phase 1 development, the masterplan permission permits the further development of 22.4 hectares of land for industrial and commercial uses (classes B1, B2 and B8) and 5.3 hectares of land for class B1 office, research and development and class D1 training facilities. Therefore whilst a large portion of the site will be designated as green infrastructure, a significant area is permitted for employment uses
1076	9	The site has already attracted a major inward investor (who chose the site having considered alternatives across a large area of England and Wales) who has already invested millions of pounds into the site. There is clear potential for this to act as a catalyst to attract further investment to the site. As the principle of employment use on the site has been established by the Phase 1 development and further enhanced by the masterplan permission, there is no reason why other companies could not come along and apply for permission to develop areas alongside the completed development for other employment uses.
1076	10	It is therefore considered that this site would now score a lot higher in terms of market attractiveness
1076	11	Taking into account the required public transport improvements as part of the masterplan permission, access to nearby settlements will be significantly improved. This together with the current remediation works being progressed would result in the site now scoring higher in this criterion.
1076	12	Overall it is considered that the Employment Land Capacity Study is already out-of-date and does not accurately reflect the suitability of Explore Industrial Park (W3) as a general employment site. The Site Allocations DPD should take account of the updated evidence in order to be sound.
1076	13	The Explore Industrial Park has been designed as a high quality industrial park which has the potential to make a significant contribution to the local economy. It should form part of the further site assessment that will be undertaken by the Council in order to reach a preferred set of sites for consideration in the second formal round of consultation: the Preferred Options report.
1076	14	As this further site assessment will be based on nine set criteria, I have set out below how the Explore Industrial Park complies with each criterion to demonstrate the suitability of the site for allocation as an employment site in the Preferred Options report.
1076	15	Laing O'Rourke has always consulted widely on its proposals for the Explore Industrial Park and maintained relationships with neighbours living in properties close to the site. In particular, the company has written directly to neighbours to inform them about key events and to offer personal meetings and site visits as required. A dedicated website was set up and kept up to date with information about site progress, frequently asked questions and details of public exhibitions.
1076	16	Public consultation sessions were also held to discuss the Phase 1 and masterplan proposals. A range of materials were displayed at the exhibitions which were designed to guide the public through the projects
1076	17	In terms of local support, at the masterplan consultation sessions, a total of 185 visitors attended the events, and of those who completed the feedback forms, 97% welcomed the investment at Steetley, whilst 97% also said they would like to see the wider site developed to generate employment.
1076	18	Large parts of the site have been used for employment purposes in the past, namely the Armstrong Quarry and Steetley Colliery. Whilst both of these uses ceased in the 1980s, the fact remains that the site has historically provided employment for hundreds of people. Steetley Colliery in particular was still employing around 500 staff in the early 1980s. Therefore the concept of employment use on the site is not new to the existing neighbouring land uses. In addition, various assessments have already been undertaken during the Phase 1 and Masterplan proposals to ensure compatibility with the neighbouring properties. For example a lighting assessment carried out as part of the masterplan EIA concluded that levels of illuminance at the windows of residential receptors will not be significantly increased by the proposals. A noise assessment was also carried out and this concluded that the noise levels at some of the relatively isolated properties which are closest to it are comparatively low. The Explore Industrial Park is therefore considered compatible with existing uses.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1076	19	western part of the site, including Armstrong Quarry Lake and the Turquoise Lagoon, and a habitat corridor either side of the realigned Darfoulds Dyke. Other wildlife corridors will be created to link these areas to the Phase I Ecological Mitigation Areas, the Access Road Ecological Landscaping Area and the railway sidings, which will also act as a wildlife corridor attractive to certain species. Habitat creation works are also being undertaken including the creation of new calcareous grassland, ephemeral and short perennial habitats and new wetland areas including ephemeral pools and scrapes as well as permanent water bodies. Further measures are being taken to enhance existing habitats, including the removal of significant areas of regenerating scrub to create a mosaic of grassland and pioneer habitats. The Green Infrastructure Framework will be carefully managed, both to protect and enhance the landscape and ecological value of the site, and to ensure public safety. Development at this site has, and will continue to enhance existing Green Infrastructure.
1076	20	There are no constraints to the delivery of this site. A permanent access road has been constructed as part of the Phase I Development. This links the Phase I site with the A619. In addition, a roundabout has been constructed at the junction of the access road and the A619. Work to provide the required off-site highway improvements and public transport improvements has been identified and these improvements will be put into place in accordance with the terms of the outline permission. In respect of remediation, significant investment including public funding has been put into the site to remediate it, and this is on-going and is due to be completed by the end of the year. Overall it is considered that the Explore Industrial Park should be allocated for employment development in the Preferred Options report. This existing employment site is being redeveloped for new employment uses and provides a significant opportunity for continued business growth and to provide a range of jobs for local residents.
1077	1	This response is a general one relating to the whole district and is made without detailed local knowledge. In our view the people best placed to give a response based on local knowledge and needs will be local Gypsies and Travellers themselves. As a hard to reach group they should be directly and if necessary informally consulted. An outreach exercise should be undertaken, if this has not already been put in train, so that communication is direct and accessible. Circular 1/2006 contains advice about this (paragraphs 27-29) and failure to carry out such an exercise could render the consultation process invalid. Any local or regional support groups should be able to help with this matter and they should be consulted directly.
1077	2	We can however make the following comments. There can be no simple solution to this issue. Provision close to existing sites would help to ensure that vital family support networks are more easily maintained and there may be scope for extending exiting sites to cater for family formation into the future. However this is not to gainsay that some Gypsies and Travellers may want to develop their own sites at new locations for a variety of reasons.
1077	3	Hence it is important that the council puts in place direct and accessible communication with local Gypsies and Travellers, both on RSL and private sites.
1077	4	In the past attempts to mix formal transit provision and transit provision have led to problems in some places. Inasmuch as some of the need for transit provision is due to visiting then consideration should be given to ensuring that there is enough space on new sites to accommodate visitors. In the same way existing RSL sites should be examined as to their potential for redesign to accommodate visitors to such sites. However it is fairly clear from around the country that there is usually a need for a separate transit facility to accommodate both peak demands and also for those visiting for work purposes who have no links with local families or who are unable to be accommodated on existing sites. Again this is an issue best consulted on directly with local Gypsies and Travellers.
1077	5	This is an issue which again will helped to be resolved by informal and formal consultation with local Gypsies and Travellers.
1078	1	First of all, in view of al the house building in Retford in the recent past, the number of new houses standing empty and the hundreds of homes currently up for sale, where are the results of studies that indicate present demand or a future demand for extra residencies in this town? It is of great concern to me and to many people I have spoken to, that no information from the Council regarding future developments has been put through our letter boxes. All the information we have received has been through word of mouth. In this respect, proper consultation should have been held with the residents prior to these proposals.
1078	2	Building in this area on this scale would not only alter and spoil the rural character of the area but the present road infrastructure would be insufficient to cope with all the influx of traffic.
1078	3	Tiln Lane is already a very busy road with large lorries avoiding the low bridge at Welham. This, at a time when the school day begins and ends at Carr Hill, makes it quite treacherous for motorists and pedestrians, children in particular. At present, the junction of Tiln Lane with Moorgate poses considerable danger and would be even more hazardous were there to be any further housing development with the ensuing traffic increase. Traffic making its way from a large housing development to join the main Welham Road would have to be via Bigsby Road, Palmer Road, Cornwall Road, Richmond Road, Park Crescent and Longholme Road. Local residents would have to put up with increased traffic noise, pollution, difficulties in parking and dangers for pedestrians. In fact, their quality of life would be greatly diminished.
1078	4	Is it proposed that a bridge would be built over the Chesterfield Canal in order to gain access to the main road near Welham?
1078	5	There are major implications regarding the runoff of surplus rainwater. Gardens and Richmond and Palmer Roads have often been flooded in the past due to new housing developments being between the two. Residents on St Saviours Close have found that after periods of heavy rain, the road becomes like a river now that bungalows have been built on the end of the field. New housing developments would overload the existing sewerage and drainage systems.
1078	6	The land in this area is also good agricultural land which in the past served local markets. It also supports a wide variety of wildlife, vegetation and trees which the Council, being supposedly environmentally conscious, should be trying to preserve.
1078	7	Furthermore, the proposed areas involve building outside the existing development boundary.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1079	1	No future development should be permitted which will put any extra traffic onto Tiln Lane (Le. areas 7, 37, 512 & 533) unless something is done to reduce present congestion and improve safety. Congestion and safety issues peak at start and end of every day at Carr Hill School. The most serious problem is the number of heavy goods vehicles using the road. The obvious solution is to place a 7.5 tonne weight limit on Smeath Lane/Tiln Lane. The lorries can continue to the AI and Retford via the outskirts of Bawtry, as they do when Tiln Lane/Smeath Lane is temporarily closed.
1079	2	The fields at the bottom of Bigsby Road (area 7) have been identified as potential development for a large number of houses. These fields -which we walk regularly -are very boggy and badly drained and substantial additional drainage works would be required to correct this. The fields are currently planted with osier which helps to reduce water retention but all this osier would have to be cleared if the site was developed.
1080	1	My wife and I are nearing retiring age and would like to down-size and move back to Sutton. We would like there to be a group of homes built, for those who, like us, love the village and want to move back into an affordable property. In retirement we will be intending to make good use of the bus service, the village hall for clubs, the church, the shop and, if it is open, the pub for meals. It would be good if a doctor's surgery could be opened too.
1080	2	We would like to see a further 40 properties (or more) built. This would be a large enough number to allow significant developments in the village's facilities. It would bring about additional employment opportunities too, surely a good thing in a rural setting.
1080	3	We feel that the village will have a new lease of life breathed into it, if a bank of new houses was to be built. Not only would retired people benefit from energy-efficient, eco homes, but also young families. They would make use of all that the village has to offer, but in different ways.
1080	4	We would like to see new businesses started in the village, if appropriate buildings could be found. A country village like Sultan has so much potential and appeal. We live in a changing world and need to plan for the future, not only for ourselves, but for our village and for future generations.
1080	5	Relating to Q114: Sites 281, 275, 276 and 452 would appear to offer clear opportunity for building development, without adversely affecting the amenity of the village.
1081	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1081	2	The village will benefit from having a good number of starter/second homes built, and sooner rather than later. Catering for young couples will indirectly benefit the local primary school, as children are born into families. It will help the local shop and maybe bring back a permanent post office. The pub would promote a sense of community. The village hall and activity groups would benefit from an influx of young adults.
1081	3	I suggest that up to 40 new houses, terraced, semis and detached will bring about desirable lifeblood development, to the benefit of the village.
1081	4	Areas to see being used, in order of priority: 1) 281; 2) 275; 3) 276; 4) 452.
1081	5	Site 281 is ideal for initial development, having its own safe access.
1081	6	Yes
1082	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1082	2	A few years ago, I graduated as a show designer. My business is growing and I need somewhere to establish a workshop. I also need to find an affordable home. I would love to be able to move to Sutton-cum-Lound where my father grew up and where my parents would like to retire to.
1082	3	A shop and a pub will allow me to shop and relax locally. The school is also seen as important.
1082	4	I would like to think that before long I will be employing a small workforce, drawn from the local community.
1082	5	I would like to see about 14 new homes built in Sutton. For there to be starter business units would attract people similar to myself.
1082	6	My brother will shortly graduate in automobile engineering. He is hoping to set up a high tech motor sport business. Like me, he would like to be near his parents and hopes that Sutton-cum-Lound can offer him a future base.
1083	1	Firstly, I wish to object to your overall analysis of Misterton's need and capacity for housing growth. I understand that Misterton is now designated as a Local Service Centre, and note your analysis that the village can accommodate 2% (156 houses) of the District's housing growth. I am concerned that you consider this growth achievable without the need to allocate further and more appropriate land for housing development, as you consider that Misterton already has more than this amount of housing with planning permission, specifically 132 houses at Fox Covert Lane. I note from your web site that you have received other representations querying how the required housing growth can be achieved, without further housing allocations. In my view the Fox Covert Lane site is unlikely to be developed in the near future to the same scale as that consented planning permission. As such I consider your reliance on this site alone to deliver the requisite housing growth as flawed. The market advice that I am in receipt of, recommends that housing growth in Misterton is more likely to be achieved through the development of small sites, where the developer risk is lessened and the release of supply is slower to match with effective demand. The market view is that Misterton requires more small scale and qualitative sites (with local distinctiveness and context), capable of integration into the fabric of the village rather than appearing as obvious extensions.
1083	2	Secondly, I am alarmed and object most strongly to your further consideration of site 87 and M3, and your conclusion that this can accommodate 190 new homes.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1083	3	You should be aware that the residents of Misterton are seeking to refurbish the Victorian Institute in the centre of the village to allow this to be used as a village hall, we are actively engaged in fund raising activities to achieve this. As such a new village hall is not likely to be required and neither is a doctors surgery as we have a perfectly suitable one at present with a pharmacy attached. Given your overall objective to limit the amount of new housing in Misterton I find your potential acceptance of these sites for housing development as totally incongruous with your own analysis and detrimental to cohesiveness of the settlement. Furthermore the continued consideration of this site will by your own admission have a prejudicial effect on how you consider the other sites in Misterton.
1083	4	Site 87 and M3 despite their adjacency to the school are remote from the village centre.
1083	5	The development of this site would be totally out of proportion, scale and character with Misterton. In effect this would constitute a suburban extension, which should be located in one of your designated regeneration areas rather than this Local Service Centre.
1083	6	Site 79 is entirely in my ownership and I have a Cooperation Agreement with the owners of sites 80 and 498 to create an access capable of meeting highway safety standards. Site 499 may also enter into this Agreement. The benefit of these sites are:
1083	7	closer to the centre of the village and so can be easily integrated into the existing village fabric,
1083	8	they would provide a discernible edge/boundary to the Misterton at this north west corner,
1083	9	and thereby improve the setting of the 2 listed buildings and specifically include an eastern buffer;
1083	10	they are contained and offer smaller scale development and will enable you to control the overall number of dwellings permitted,
1083	11	the site context will dictate a quality design solution, I am investigating how this might be controlled through design coding and
1083	12	they would add to and vary the housing offer in Misterton which will be beneficial overall to the village economy and its aesthetic appeal.
1084	1	If the maximum number of properties is constructed the density seems high for the land area.
1084	2	New development - connected to existing aged infrastructure (roads, sewers and other services)
1084	3	We already find it difficult at peak times with these, especially roads, broadband etc.
1084	4	Single access point for roads will necessitate journeys through the existing estates which are unsuitable for this volume of traffic.
1084	5	Need to ensure no loss of habitat for bats and other species present in the area
1084	6	Against loss of greenfield site especially as it is in such an isolated position and is not shown adjacent other development land.
1084	7	I would suggest land to the west be evaluated as positive development land. This would enable complete new infrastructure with road links directly on to major roads.
1084	8	Against Worksop area being further developed to the level suggested as Retford appears to have more scope, although not shown.
1085	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and other villages and will only contribute to the "urban sprawl" and close the gap between the communities further.
1085	2	The land is well used by the farmer to produce products for the local area such as wheat and oil seed rape and would incur lost jobs to the local area. Building properties in areas does not necessarily reduce unemployment as building companies use the own staff from further away.
1085	3	The area proposed has several woodlands and they seem to be the only social part of ~ Gateford estate that residents use, as there is nothing been provided by the council except a pair of "goal posts" for young children.
1085	4	The shopping area which is sited off the estate is full to capacity and access is already dangerous when leaving the shops onto Theivesdale lane and Gateford Road. All of the main amenities for the residents of Gateford are around the centre of Worksop. Considering the number of houses being proposed facilities of having a new primary and secondary having to be built to accommodate the influx of young families taking up residency as the current schools are full to capacity
1085	5	New doctors surgeries would be needed or the current ones moved, as parking around the ') current ones is so hazardous and will be even more when the new cinema is opened.
1085	6	Looking at the site as it stand there would appear to be only 2 access road into the new estate, both on Ashes Park Avenue at the second and third roundabout It is impossible to get onto Gateford Road any time during the day with Little ease and have a further potential 600 or so cars using this and the roundabouts would be very dangerous. There would have to be access roads put into the site from Owdy Lane also. Further more if you undertook to do an analysis of were the current residents of Gateford are employed you will find that about 80 % commute to outside towns such as Sheffield, Retford and Mansfield. In view of this the A57 from the Dinnington roundabout to the M1 at junction 31 would need to be upgraded to a dual carriageway to accommodate the extra traffic. Already this area of road is a major problem remember the cold weather period of last year when the road became blocked for several days?
1085	7	Upgrades to the Electricity grid would be required as during the winter periods power cuts have occurred frequently which have also affected Gateford Hill Care Centre were some of the estates elderly residents live
1086	1	I would like to know why there is a need for this "affordable" housing in Worksop at all. The property pages of the Worksop Guardian advertise many low cost homes either for rent or for sale, so people are able to live here if they want.
1086	2	I would also like to know how the houses which will be built can compare with the existing prices and still be financially viable. How will the schools, health centres and the hospital cope with an increased population?
1086	3	I understand that the Blyth Rd development is to be mixed, but will there be enough local employment opportunities. Especially considering the problems travelling along the congested and narrow A57 to Sheffield, and the lack of a bus service as well as the busy train to the city. Doncaster the other large nearby city has unemployment difficulties of its own.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1086	4	At the moment the site is used for recreation and this valuable asset would be lost, as well detracting from the view across to the Trent valley.
1087	1	My concerns are for this close knit community, made up of mainly elderly and disabled people, some of whom have lived here for many years. This area is mainly made up of bungalows, it is a safe quiet neighbourhood overlooking open countryside with an abundance of wildlife which brings pleasure to a lot of people some of which are housebound.
1087	2	The extra housing this development would bring would also bring more traffic, noise pollution and safety issues for both road users and pedestrians.
1087	3	The anxiety some of these proposals are causing to some of the most vulnerable people in our community is very concerning.
1087	4	The area of Tiln Lane causes me great concern as it is a very busy road which a lot of high sided HGVs use as the main route to Gainsborough to avoid the Low Bridge at Welham. There is also a large primary school on Tiln Lane. At school times this is a no go area for residents. If you are driving along Tiln Lane and meet an HGV coming the other way with both parents' cars and school buses parked either side of the road it comes to a standstill, so bringing more traffic congestion into the area is total madness.
1087	5	There has already been one child killed on Tiln Lane, please do not make this situation any worse than it already is for both children and the elderly.
1087	6	I think the mixed use sites at 51, R7, 259 and R2 should be used in preference as the road is a main road which would not cause problems for the residents in that area.
1088	1	As a regular visitor to North Wheatley, I would not like to see the village have some of the larger developments that are on offer as I feel it would be detrimental to the village atmosphere.
1088	2	I would, however, like plot number 236 with adjacent paddock of Whitegates to be considered for a small development.
1088	3	The reason for this is that it would offer a natural extension to the village envelope whilst creating minimal disturbance to other residents, as there would be ample room for them to have gardens and off-road parking etc, whilst still supporting the village.
1089	1	Option B: Focused in just one of the above towns
1089	2	Broadly yes, this would provide a commensurate increase in the housing within the village, given that ill-considered development took place during the 70's which increased the housing stock by 50%
1089	3	536 This would largely avoid changing the appearance of the village beyond those alterations that have already taken place.
1089	4	No large scale further development should be allowed.
1089	5	For instance those areas shown to the east (275 276 299 482) should not be considered for development as they would destroy the approach from Lound, the only aspect of the old village now remaining where residents have carefully and expensively retained the rural appearance of their properties.
1089	6	A problem exists in this lowest area of the village with drainage of surface water
1089	7	The only access/exit from this area is via Lound Low Rd (Portland Place is too narrow to take further traffic) and this would place potentially 250-300 extra vehicles onto a bus route with awkward and dangerous bends
1089	8	Yes
1089	9	Keep them concentrated within existing sites but proper supervision is especially important on mixed sites.
1089	10	They should be concentrated in or around existing sites provided that they are adequately supervised.
1090	1	No specific comment to make
1090	2	We would like to see approximately 100 houses in the village
1090	3	Site 520
1090	4	Option A
1091	1	Yes I believe you have adopted a professional approach to choosing sites
1091	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1091	3	I disagree. Presumably its 4 new house over the next 15 or so years. This is just not sustainable. We have a school that struggles for pupil intake. Unless there is further development the next generation will have to move away. I think Sutton could easily absorb another 20 properties
1091	4	I really don't have any preferences. All I would suggest is the sites that offer the least resistance
1091	5	I want to see houses that people can afford to buy. Even starter homes with current requirements for 15% 20% deposits are not affordable. The development I'd prefer are those offering half rent half mortgage
1091	6	The sites should be left alone
1091	7	Around existing sites. New gypsy sites are always going to be contentious and I feel around existing sites will cause the least animosity
1091	8	Together for the reason given in 121
1091	9	Not aware of any
1092	1	Yes
1092	2	Option A

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1092	3	We disagree. The detention centre site is only partially complete and will eventually provide almost 70 new homes. It is already evident that it is having a detrimental aesthetic impact on the village. The adverse impact it will have due to the village's lack of amenities, school capacity and additional traffic has yet to be established. No further development should be considered until this site is completed
1092	4	with the possible exception of Plot 134 on Finkell Street. This site has a number of derelict buildings which could be converted or developed to provide two additional properties.
1092	5	We have recently had sight of a document and proposed site plan which indicates that the owner of Plot 135 - Hidden Meadow on Low Street - wishes to demolish the existing bungalow, develop the land to the rear of it with 6 no. large dwellings and to donate the substantial area fronting Low Street to the Parish Council and/or local residents for 'community use and enjoyment'.
1092	6	We object to an area of private garden which we have overlooked for forty years being developed into 'a public open space/gardens for full community use and enjoyment'.
1092	7	We are not aware that the Parish Council would wish to take on such a responsibility and we know that the local residents would not. With regard to the development to the site we object on the following grounds:
1092	8	(a) Low Street is very narrow - less than 4 metres wide in many places - and it has no footpaths with no possibility of providing any. It has dangerous corners at both ends and is regularly blocked by delivery vehicles, refuse wagons, etc. Bringing more vehicles onto this road can only make the situation worse.
1092	9	(b) Low Street and Horsewells Road have suffered from drainage problems for many years, both surface water and foul. This development can only exacerbate the problems.
1092	10	Plot 134 on Finkell Street has a number of seriously dilapidated buildings which should be demolished for safety reasons. It therefore seems reasonable to develop this site.
1092	11	Yes
1092	12	REMOVED
1093	1	Location 35 is extremely unsuitable. The Gateford area is already having difficulty in coping with the population already present here. At busy times we take a long time to get out of the estate because of traffic volume
1093	2	At present there are not enough facilities for the residents and their children(who congregate in Ashes park Avenue as they have no facilities to entertain them)
1093	3	The loss of farmland and woods will make the quality of life much poorer for the existing residents of the estate
1093	4	I therefore think that development at this site will not add anything to Worksop town and will lead only to value destruction of all parameters for the present and future residents around the proposed development.
1094	1	Yes
1094	2	The town requires more employment growth.
1094	3	There appears to be empty properties available within the area currently so is there a requirement for more housing - especially in area of poor employment opportunity
1094	4	Sites 40 52 and 1, 364 and 41 - these are close together and would limit disruption to the town, provide a high number of housing in the location making the infrastructure investment a better payback option and would minimise problems for local residents. The road network could strongly support development in this area, and access to this area could be gained without disruption to current residential areas.
1094	5	The land appears to be high at these points and would appear to be less likely to have flooding issues in the future.
1094	6	7, 46 and 309
1094	7	No, should be single use sites only
1094	8	Although I agree with the screening methodology I do believe that the Council needs to strongly consider the overall character of the town and what makes this currently an attractive place to live. By over developing the very essence that attracts current residents could be lost - and could result in a loss of residents.
1094	9	Yes the open spaces identified should be protected
1094	10	No - these should remain as open spaces
1094	11	Option A
1094	12	They should be located in and around existing traveller sites as the infrastructure should already be in place - and could be more easily extended. This should cause minimum disruption and allow the travelling community to create an extended community together. This should also allow services such as health to be able to plan its delivery of services in a co-ordinated, efficient manner.
1094	13	For Gypsy and traveller sites the transit and residential pitches should be provided together. These sites could then allow travelling families to come back to gather with relatives who occupy the residential pitches.
1094	14	The reason for my objections are that this area represents one of the most attractive residential areas within the town. The type of housing is individual and the reduction of any open space within this area would detract from its general appearance. Additional traffic, people and pollution would also detract from the health and well being of the current residents without any obvious benefit in return.
1094	15	An increase in number of residents within the area could also lead to an increase in crime rates (an example of this could be the development at Witham St Hughes), and increase in anti-social behaviour - which this area does not currently suffer from in high numbers.
1094	16	Further objections would be that development here would place undue pressure on the road network, where access to London Road is already limited.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1094	17	The current road network around the proposed site is made up of 'lanes' and hedgerows. The loss of these would be a tragedy in the local community. These lanes are heavily used by ramblers, walkers, those looking for a pleasant walk, the running club, dog walkers, families with children on bikes and toys and horse riders. Residents across the town walk up to enjoy the pleasant hedgerows and open space which they currently enjoy on their doorstep. The lanes are also used by the local farmers for the transference of their stock. Also the utilities within the area already suffer - water pressure is variable and the sewer network is at capacity.
1094	18	Further more the areas identified are along the bottom of a natural hill and prone to flooding - which was experienced during the last floods and for which the road has still not been repaired.
1094	19	New housing within this area would also place pressure on the local junior school - which has already had to extend to meet the demand of the last development on Rutland Road estate. The local secondary schools are not within easy walking distance of this location.
1095	1	Generally yes
1095	2	IN MY OPINION THE TOWN WOULD BENEFIT FROM A SMALL EXPANSION - AS COVERED BY SITES ALREADY ALLOCATED WITHIN THE EXISTING BOUNDARY. I DO NOT SUPPORT AN ADDITIONAL 500+ AS PROPOSED. THE EXISTING TOWN BOUNDARY SHOULD BE PRESERVED.
1095	3	ADDITIONAL EMPLOYMENT SHOULD BE CONCENTRATED AROUND THE EXISTING RANDALL WAY WHICH OFFERS LOCATIONS WHICH SHOULD ATTRACT HIGH TECH BUSINESS.
1095	4	I WOULD PREFER TO SEE ADDITIONAL HOUSING LOCATED OUTSIDE OF RETFORD AND SEE AREA LIKE HARWORTH IN NEED OF MORE REDEVELOPMENT. I COULD SEE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SMALL SATELLITE COMMUNITY WHICH COULD BE SELF SUSTAINABLE BUT OPERATING AS A SATELLITE TO THE LARGER COMMUNITIES NEARBY.
1095	5	I HAVE PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE SITES 511, 370 AND 3. I WOULD NOT SUPPORT 511 AND 370 UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES. THE LOCAL ROADS ARE ALREADY DIFFICULT TO ACCESS ESPECIALLY AT SCHOOL DROP OFF AND COLLECTION TIMES. THE EXIT OF TRAFFIC ONTO LONDON ROAD IS ALSO CONGESTED AT THESE TIMES. AT OTHER TIMES EXISTING ROADS CAN COPE BUT WILL NOT COPE WITH AN INCREASE
1095	6	511 IS ALSO PRONE TO FLOODING
1095	7	PLOT 3 WOULD NEED AN IMAGINATIVE EXIT DIRECTLY ONTO TO LONDON ROAD AND NOT THROUGH EXISTING ESTATE ROADS.
1095	8	IN MY OPINION NONE OF THESE SITES ARE SUITABLE AS THEY EXPAND THE EXISTING TOWN BOUNDARY WHICH SHOULD BE PRESERVED.
1095	9	Option B
1095	10	Existing locations would prove marginally less contentious
1095	11	Together should prove easier to manage
1096	1	Option A
1096	2	I agree that enough land should be allocated for around 9 new houses.
1096	3	From all the proposed sites, I would most like to see 517 developed. I feel this would help to join the existing housing on Mill Farm to the village
1096	4	I would then also like to see improved pavements along that section of road and the 30mph speed limit zone moved to further outside the village, as currently it is much too close to the school.
1096	5	The proposed site 482 is a flood plain. In the past, during heavy rain, the field has flooded and in extreme cases the houses nearest the field have had their gardens and under floors flooded. Those houses have a very deep cavity underneath their floorboards to cope with a small amount of flooding. If building were to take place on this site, then the newly built houses are at a very great risk of flooding and it will also mean that as the field is no longer there to take most of the flood water, more water is going to need to go somewhere and that will mean the existing housing is at a much greater risk of flooding. This is completely unacceptable.
1096	6	The proposed protected open spaces should absolutely be protected. If the village population is to grow, we certainly cannot lose any valuable open space.
1097	1	No
1097	2	Option A
1097	3	No, no more houses in our village
1097	4	No sites above
1097	5	Yes. The play area and football field should be protected
1098	1	Our clients generally agree with the criteria in the Screening Methodology as indicated in the Bassetlaw Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation Paper November 2011.
1098	2	In terms of Site Number 246 – Brough Lane, Elkesley – the Bassetlaw District LDF Final Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Volume 2 for Elkesley Sites October 2011, it was identified that this site was Suitable, Available and Achievable in the Plan-Period up to 2028.
1098	3	In terms of Site Number 248 – Coalpit Lane, Elkesley – the Bassetlaw District LDF Final Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Volume 2 for Elkesley Sites October 2011, it was identified that this site was Suitable, Available and Achievable in the Plan-Period up to 2028.
1098	4	In terms of Site Number 249 – Coalpit Lane, Elkesley – the Bassetlaw District LDF Final Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Volume 2 for Elkesley Sites October 2011, it was identified that this site was Suitable, Available and Achievable in the Plan-Period up to 2028.
1098	5	Option A

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1098	6	The text at paragraph 10.43 of the Consultation Paper states, in the first bullet point, that On average (mean) 11 new houses could be built within the village up to 2028; however the Question asks Do you agree that enough land should be allocated in Elkesley for at least 11 new houses..... The differing phrasing of the words is not just semantics, but does give rise to some real confusion. If our client takes it that there is only to be sufficient land allocated for 11 new dwellings in Elkesley in the plan-period from 2012-2028 i.e. 0.7 dwellings per year, then they disagree with the assertion. If our client takes it that there is to be sufficient land allocated for a minimum of 11 dwellings (with a maximum of?) within the plan-period, then this is something to consider further.
1098	7	As advised, the client made representations at the draft SHLAA and Core Strategy and Development Management Issues and Options consultation events as to the likely level of housing development which could come forward to the identified sites. However, it is anticipated that some of the potential land budget of the identified sites could accommodate sports pitches, allotments and extra play area equipment in order to support any new housing development.
1098	8	Our client notes that the proposed outline planning application for a maximum of 33 dwellings off Yew Tree Close, Elkesley was refused under the Delegated Powers of Bassetlaw District Council on the 24th January 2012. This application was refused for reason of its prematurity to the adoption of the Site Allocations DPD.
1098	9	Our client has not identified any further issues that have not already been raised by way of this consultation response or the views expressed by the residents' questionnaire.
1098	10	Any audit of the quality and quantity of formal and informal public open space should be subjected to a detailed analysis of the existing stock within the District, assessed against national standards provided by Natural England, Sport England, CABI, together with provisions contained in PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation.
1098	11	In general, however, our client would be willing to enter into negotiations with the Primary School to extend their school sports pitches into their Site 246.
1099	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1099	2	Approximately 70 houses are being built on the old detention centre site. The impact of such a large increase in the population of the village is unknown.
1099	3	Villages generally expand very slowly and we think it would be wrong to allow further development until the residents of the detention centre properties have been fully integrated within the community.
1099	4	None
1099	5	The village has some unique features primarily the open spaces within the heart of the village these should be preserved.
1099	6	It is preferable to expand existing sites and improve amenities and services at these sites to ensure good standards and less impact.
1099	7	Ideally together but this would be more beneficial if sites were close to main trunk roads.
1100	1	Do not believe, as there is no major employer in the town
1100	2	No preferences
1100	3	No preferences if there is a demand for such sites
1100	4	believe that sites should be segregated - either housing or industrial/commercial
1100	5	Improvements are needed to assist traffic flow in the town, particularly when the A1 road is blocked for any reason.
1100	6	Emphatically YES
1100	7	No firm opinions
1100	8	Option A
1100	9	New locations The excessive growth of any particular site can lead to the problems which have recently attracted so much publicity
1100	10	Separately. Reasons? See above
1101	1	Yes
1101	2	No. Bearing in mind the significant loss in major employment in recent years (Bridon, Jenison's and Northern Rubbers) there should be no need for more housing growth above that already required.
1101	3	Not, repeat not, Site 69 on the southern side of the Chesterfield canal. This would result in loss of privacy of the houses on Brixworth Way which back on to the canal
1101	4	traffic and road safety issues on Welham Road
1101	5	loss of significant ecological habitats
1101	6	an adverse impact on public visual amenity
1101	7	Continued development of the new industrial estates on the north side of town (off Randall Way)
1101	8	Yes
1101	9	Option a
1102	1	No comment
1102	2	Option A.
1102	3	No
1102	4	This "feedback" is very misleading. It is, I suspect a simple average of the responses received:- If (say) one person favoured 140 houses (perhaps because they own a potential site) and nine people favoured none then the "average" would be 14. This is not properly representative of the collective view and is not a sound conclusion statistically.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1102	5	None of them. There is already a major shortage of resources in the village (e.g. no village hall) and also more houses will diminish the village character and turn it into a dormitory serving Worksop and Retford, or places even further away.
1102	6	No viable pub
1102	7	No village hall
1102	8	No meeting room for scouts etc.
1102	9	REMOVED
1103	1	No comment
1103	2	Option A.
1103	3	No
1103	4	This "feedback" is very misleading. It is, I suspect a simple average of the responses received:- If (say) one person favoured 140 houses (perhaps because they own a potential site)and nine people favoured none then the "average" would be 14. This is not properly representative of the collective view and is not a sound conclusion statistically.
1103	5	None of them. There is already a major shortage of resources in the village (e.g. no village hall) and also more houses will diminish the village character and turn it into a dormitory serving Worksop and Retford, or places even further away.
1103	6	No viable pub
1103	7	No village hall
1103	8	No meeting room for scouts etc.
1103	9	Prefer none at all
1104	1	British Waterways is aware that Site 93 (land south of Ashdown Way, Misterton) has previously been the subject of planning applications for marina development, most recently in 2006. British Waterways has established a New Marinas Unit to facilitate successful marina developments and we have in place an application process which is designed to help us manage potentially competing demands on water resources and other facilities from multiple developers in a fair way. The expansion in mooring capacity is generally constrained by factors such as water supply and navigational safety.
1104	2	Without further information regarding the proposed allocation of Site 93 for a mixed use development centred on a canal-linked marina we are unable to confirm our position on navigational safety issues as no navigation access point is shown. We are also unable to advise if our infrastructure, at this time, is able to accommodate the proposed marina development as no assessment of water resources or boat traffic modelling has been provided.
1104	3	This information would also assist us in determining if there are issues relating to ecological matters which we would need to consider. We are aware that water voles have been found to be present in the canal bank adjacent to the site and there may be implications for the Chesterfield Canal SSSI (approximately 250m west of the site) in relation to additional boat movements.
1104	4	British Waterways has advised in respect of previous applications for planning permission for marina developments on this site that we have concerns over elements of the design of the schemes. Any prospective developer will need to engage with British Waterways' marina application process to establish if it is possible to agree a Network Access Agreement to connect to our water space and to consider other issues such as a requirement for our consent to provide a bridge over the canal and to address continuation of the towpath. We strongly recommend engagement with British Waterways to discuss the issues and determine if this is a proposal that British Waterways is able to support and to therefore establish whether such a development in this location is deliverable.
1104	5	Option A
1105	1	No comment to make at this time
1105	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1105	3	The figure of five houses has been derived from very limited responses received for local residents. Whilst it gives an indication of how those people that chose to respond might view development in the village (some said more than 5 houses, some said no houses - average was 5 houses). This does not provide an indication of either need for housing or how new housing might be accommodated in the village. We therefore afford little weight to figure
1105	4	There are various sites that have been identified in the village. One of these is the former school on Rectory Land. This presents a unique position in that the built area is mostly brownfield land and the main building is Listed. Plans are being formulated that will see a conversion or re-use of buildings on site for residential use, with a limited number of new-build dwellings. It is difficult to say exactly how many houses will be created. Justification for the scheme relates to the urgent need to protect the Listed building. Suggesting an arbitrary limit of 5 units may be inappropriate, although it may not be relevant in this case given the special circumstances
1105	5	Five units may in any case be rather low and prevent any schemes being viable. Site should instead be considered on their individuals merits.
1105	6	We support the development of site 410 (former Bramcote Lorne School). That is a brownfield site that could be redeveloped appropriately to provide sufficient housing to meet the needs of the village (what ever they may be).
1105	7	Again other site should be considered on their individual merits including whether they constitute greenfield or brownfield development.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1105	8	We support the development of Site 410 in the strongest terms. This is a former school with a prominent Listed building and a range of ancillary buildings on site. As has been experienced at the King Edward School nearby in Retford, leaving a valuable heritage asset to disuse over a period of time will lead to its deterioration and placement on the Buildings at risk register. The site presents a unique opportunity for conversion and reuse of existing buildings for residential (and possibly other) uses. There is also scope for a limited amount of appropriate new build development as part of remodelling of the site. The justification for development is more linked to protection and enhancement of the heritage assets (the Listed elements and the Conservation Area). Development will not mean wholesale removal of greenfield land. The draft Sites Plan identifies the site as a potential opportunity, as development will be justified by other means. A number of background studies are in process, with the initial findings pointing that an appropriate and acceptable scheme can indeed be promoted on site. The supporting text will need to reflect the potential and need for limited additional new build housing on site. These will be discussed with the Council in the coming weeks. By excluding the site and not allocating it means that a heritage asset will undoubtedly degenerate and be placed at risk.
1106	1	I AGREE IN PRINCIPLE WITH THE SCREENING CRITERIA. I FEEL THAT THE TRANSPORT/ACCESS PRACTICALITIES SHOULD BE GIVEN MORE PRIORITY.
1106	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1106	3	I AGREE THAT, AS SUGGESTED IN PREVIOUS FEEDBACK, NO MORE THAN 13 HOUSES.
1106	4	AS ABOVE I THINK 13 PROPERTIES ARE SUFFICIENT, THEREFORE WOULD ONLY WANT THE PROPOSED 5 AFFORDABLE HOUSES.
1106	5	I HAVE LOOKED AT THE POTENTIAL SITES PUT FORWARD, AND WOULD NOT LIKE TO SEE ANY, OTHER THAN 409 DEVELOPED
1106	6	400, 491, 409, 463, 296 ARE ALL ACCESSED OFF HIGH STREET OR CHAPEL LANE, WHICH BOTH EXIT ONTO THE A631. THIS ROAD RISES TO A PEAK JUST AROUND THE HIGH STREET MATTERSEY ROAD CROSS ROADS. FROM THE EAST ONE CANNOT SEE ABOVE THIS PEAK, TRAFFIC APPROACHING FROM THE WEST, UNTIL OPPOSITE THE SUN INN, SIMILARLY THE TRAFFIC APPROACHING FROM THE WEST CANNOT SEE TRAFFIC PULLING OUT FROM HIGH STREET, UNTIL NEAR THE JUNCTION. THE TURN INTO CHAPEL LANE FROM THE WEST IS A LESS THAN 90 DEGREE TURN WITH AN EXISTING HOUSE WALL BLOCKING THE VIEW
1106	7	405 SITE IS TOO CLOSE TO THIS PEAK ALSO WITH LITTLE TIME TO REACT TO BUSY EXIT, WHICH ANY LARGE DEVELOPMENT COULD RESULT IN, NOT TO MENTION THE PEAK SCHOOL TRAFFIC!
1106	8	IN MY OPINION DEVELOPMENT OF THE REMAINING 406, 407, 477 AND PROBABLY 484, WOULD ALSO PRESENT SIMILAR PROBLEMS. HAVING LIVED IN THE VILLAGE SINCE 1978, THESE ARE OBSERVATIONS MADE OVER MANY YEARS OF WALKING IN THE VILLAGE, USING AND CROSSING ALL THESE JUNCTIONS.
1106	9	COMMENTS ABOUT PRIVATE VEHICLE USE ARE RELEVANT IN THE FACE OF THE FACT THAT THE BUS COMPANY HAS CHOSEN TO TERMINATE THE 27 BUS FOR MAY OF ITS 2 HOURLY RUNS TO RETFORD AT MATTERSEY, PROVIDING A 'PHONE THE BUS' SERVICE FOR THE MORNING RUN, AND SEVERELY REDUCING THE NUMBER OF BUSES TO BAWTRY, MAKING THE USE OF PRIVATE VEHICLES EVEN MORE NECESSARY.
1106	10	THE VILLAGE ALREADY SUFFERS FROM A LACK OF OFF STREET PARKING DUE TO INFILL DEVELOPMENT, LACK OF OFF STREET PARKING DUE TO AGE OF A NUMBER OF THE PROPERTIES. whilst DEVELOPERS CAN BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE 'SUFFICIENT' PARKING FOR NEW HOUSES, OCCUPIERS CANNOT BE MADE TO USE THEM. SERVICE VEHICLES DELIVERING PARCELS, TRADESMEN, AND THE INFREQUENT BUS, ALREADY FIND NEGOTIATING THE RESTRICTED VILLAGE TRAFFIC ROUTES DIFFICULT AT TIMES. DELIVERIES MADE TO THE PROPERTIES ON THE A631 CAN RESTRICT THE VIEW, MAKING THE ALREADY DIFFICULT EGRESS FROM THE VILLAGE ROADS TO THE A631 DANGEROUS.
1106	11	I THINK THE EXISTING GREEN SPACES SHOULD BE PROTECTED
1106	12	ALTHOUGH THE SCHOOL GREEN SPACE IS NOT CURRENTLY A PUBLIC GREEN SPACE. WERE THE SCHOOL TO CLOSE I THINK THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE SHOULD BE RESTRICTED.
1107	1	The screening methodology appears to be comprehensive and thorough.
1107	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1107	3	Yes, land should be allocated for at least four new houses in Sutton. However the resident's survey results as listed in the consultation document does not use the expression "at least".
1107	4	I agree that land for more than four houses should be provided for over the next 16 years however it is important that the ambiguity of this question is not taken advantage of.
1107	5	A more organic and natural growth of housing as and when the opportunity arises should be the only approach.
1107	6	My preference for development would be on sites 536, 275 and 452.
1107	7	I would also agree with limited development of sites 276 and 274 (with a reduction in the number of dwellings involved).
1107	8	I am strongly against any building on site 282 and against development at sites 281 and 299.
1107	9	Affordable housing for local residents should form the basis to any land being made available. Rather than council owned properties being built, schemes allowing the part funding of property purchase and ownership should be investigated and employed.
1107	10	A limited number of housing projects should be allowed however development on all of these sites would be wrong and development to the potential numbers outlined would ruin the village.
1107	11	All of the open spaces identified must be protected from all future developments
1107	12	No new Gypsy sites are required. The Daneshill site is regularly empty and is never close to capacity. Further provision is simply not required.
1107	13	Should any new sites be established they should be concentrated on existing sites. Such projects cause alarm for those households affected locally however the expansion of existing (underused) sites is far more palatable.
1107	14	These pitches should be provided together for reasons already outlined. Such projects cause alarm for those households affected locally however the expansion of existing (underused) sites is far more palatable

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1107	15	I would also prefer the minimum possible expenditure given to this project.
1107	16	Existing Daneshill site. This is underused and often unoccupied.
1108	1	We are concerned that the wording of Criterion 8 lacks emphasis on habitats and species. Planning Policy Statement 9 advises local authorities to conserve, enhance and add to UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats, with the list of habitats first set out in Section 74 (2) of the CROW Act 2000 and subsequently amended by the UK BAP. The land classification of sites when they contain semi-natural habitat should make reference to UK BAP Habitats when assessing suitability and consider impacts on those Priority Habitats (and the habitats of UK BAP Priority Species) in order to guide a strategic approach to sustaining and creating networks of habitats, a principle of PPS9. It is hoped that by presenting a strongly worded criterion for biodiversity in the screening methodology it will ensure that surveys will be undertaken on land that has no designation and where ecological knowledge is lacking.
1108	2	It is encouraging to note the breadth of open sites across Worksop that are to be protected. It is important to ensure however, that additional Green Infrastructure is created with the advent of new development within the Worksop area. New GI provides real biodiversity benefits. Natural England recommends that local communities should have access to an appropriate mix of green spaces with at least 2 ha of accessible natural green space per 1000 population with the following accessibility criteria: No person should live more than 300 metres from their nearest area of natural green space; At least one hectare of Local Nature Reserve should be provided per 1000 population; There should be at least one accessible 20 ha site with 2 km; o There should be one accessible 500 ha site within 10 km. If it is considered that Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) needs to be provided to mitigate against impacts on the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC then there are clear guidelines from Natural England about the attributes of a SANG. New wildlife sites should seek to create the most appropriate UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitat for the location, in order to help achieve the targets set out in The East Midlands Regional Plan (2009) (Appendix 3, Policy 29); Increasing the number of Green Flag sites in the District is another way of ensuring that high quality sites are provided.
1108	3	We are very concerned about potential residential development of Site 38 due to the following: The adjacent area meets the criteria to be a 'key reptile site' due to it supporting three species of reptile; common lizard, grass snake and a significant population of slow worm; Tranker Wood SINC and Tranker Marsh SINC are in close proximity to the development site and therefore it is essential that these SINCS are protected from any development proposal; The presence of Nottinghamshire BAP habitats acid grassland, standing water and semi-natural grassland. Residential development will inevitably result in an increase of visitors to the site and cats would almost certainly have a detrimental impact on the reptile population. For this reason we are of the opinion that the only form of development acceptable for Site 38 is offices, light industry, storage/distribution, food store, hotel and restaurants.
1108	4	Site 14 - This site is adjacent to Sandhill Lake LWS (SINC 2/390) and Chesterfield Canal Shireoaks to Welham LWS (SINC 2/621) and so there could be impacts on the SINC.
1108	5	Site 195/343/W8 - This site is adjacent to Woodsetts Pond Local Nature Reserve and SINC.
1108	6	Site 35 - This site creates an urban extension towards SINCS 2/113 (Owday Wood), 2/115 (Rough Piece) 5/2318 (Whipman Wood and 5/2127 Nab's Ashes Marsh.
1108	7	Site 30. Adjacent to Lady Lee Quarry Nature Reserve (SINC)
1108	8	Site 38. Adjacent to SINC 2/121 (Tranker Wood).
1108	9	Local Wildlife Sites and Local Nature Reserves represent important areas of nature conservation value in the county and have a fundamental role to play in meeting overall national biodiversity targets; contributing to the quality of life and the well-being of the community; and in supporting research and education. They should therefore, be sacrosanct and protected from the negative impacts of development and should be a material consideration when assessing the planning application. Policy DM9: B. Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that development proposals will be expected to take opportunities to restore or enhance habitats and species' populations and to demonstrate that they will not adversely affect or result in the loss of features of recognised importance, including: Local Wildlife Sites (Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) Non-statutory designated sites do not receive statutory protection but they do receive policy protection (as "Local Sites") as reflected in Planning Policy Statement 9 (PPS9) which suggests that Local Sites have a key role to play in helping to meet national biodiversity targets and therefore appropriate consideration should be given to Local Sites when making planning decisions.
1108	10	We welcome the proposed protection of a network of green spaces but it is essential that new areas of Green Infrastructure (GI) are created through new development that link coherently with existing GI. The aim should be for creating quality open spaces that provide real biodiversity benefits, sports and playing fields; Creation of green corridors to enhance links to the countryside beyond sites. Enhancements to existing habitats and the local landscape; proposals must provide targeted and significant Green Infrastructure that maximises biodiversity opportunities and protects and enhances existing ecological features (SINCS and wildlife corridors) and provide significant additional areas of GI to minimise the pressure on those ecological features. The GI provision should aim to buffer existing ecological features and improve habitat connectivity and avoid fragmentation of ecological features. The creation and enhancement of Green Infrastructure through development must contribute to Biodiversity Action Plans to halt and reverse the decline in priority habitats and species. Measures to mitigate any detrimental impact on environmental and built heritage features on and adjacent to the site in line with Core Policy 12A; we would like to see more emphasis placed on avoidance of damage to Local Wildlife Sites rather than ' measures to mitigate any detrimental impact on environmental
1108	11	Site 46 appears to include part of Longholme Pasture SINC (2/633) and should this be the case then we would not support development that would result in damage to or complete loss of the SINC.
1108	12	We also note that Site 7 is considered as 'maybe' suitable for development in the Bassetlaw District Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). We would take this opportunity to raise awareness about two pairs of barn owls nesting adjacent to the site. These birds use Site 7 as a hunting ground. Barn owl is included on Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 which means it is afforded additional protection and cannot be intentionally or recklessly disturbed when nesting. Protected species are a material consideration when determining a planning application. A survey of the site would be required to assess its ecological value and whether there would be a need for further surveys to ensure that protected species are properly considered in the determination of any planning application.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1108	13	We consider Site 69 unsuitable for development. The area consists of rough grassland and is low lying and consequently is prone to flooding. This habitat variation during the year increases its biodiversity value. The site is likely to have skylark, reedbunting and meadow pipit nesting on the site, all ground nesting birds of conservation concern. The habitat is also likely to be attractive for grass snake. The presence of the Chesterfield Canal adjacent to this area will add to the biodiversity of the area as a whole. A survey of the site would be required to assess its ecological value and whether there would be a need for further surveys to ensure that protected species are properly considered in the determination of any planning application. The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act came into force on 1st Oct 2006. Section 41 (S41) of the Act requires the Secretary of State to publish a list of habitats and species which are of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England. The list has been drawn up in consultation with Natural England, as required by the Act. The S41 list is used to guide decision-makers such as public bodies, including local and regional authorities, in implementing their duty under section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in England, when carrying out their normal functions. The habitat within the site is included on the list as Lowland Meadow.
1108	14	Site 187 would isolate Whitehouse Plantation (LWS 2/570). Ideally, LWSs should be buffered to minimise edge effects from human encroachment and linked to other areas of semi-natural habitat to maximise their nature conservation value and allow the movement of wildlife along these habitat corridors (see the response to Question 7 for further detail).
1108	15	We do not object to the redevelopment of Harworth Colliery but we wish to take this opportunity to highlight the existing nature conservation value of the site and encourage any new development to be as wildlife friendly as possible. Surveys have revealed a total of four grass snakes and therefore an appropriate mitigation scheme will need to be devised to ensure there is no negative impact on reptiles as a result of new. Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) it is illegal to intentionally kill or injure grass snakes and therefore every reasonable effort should be made to reduce the risk of harm to grass snake. We suggest the following wording may be appropriate; <i>No work will commence until full details have been provided on a reptile translocation scheme including the identification of a suitable receptor site, extent and type of exclusion fencing that will be required to prevent animals returning or entering the search area and the minimum number of trapping days being carried out. The methodology will need to be approved by the local Natural England team. The mitigation scheme agreed with Natural England and the Local Planning Authority needs to be carried out to fulfil the discharge of this condition.</i>
1108	16	We note that that in the longer term a minimum number of four and possibly more ponds could be retained in the new development and that ponds will be subject to management work to enhance their wildlife value. Whilst we welcome this, the proposal is likely to result in a net loss of pond habitat and therefore we request that new wildlife friendly ponds are created as compensation.
1108	17	We would also hope that every effort could be made to maximise the nature conservation value of the built environment. A development proposal of this magnitude should consider the incorporation of green/brown roofs within the employment use development as amelioration for habitat loss as well as additional habitat creation. Brownfield habitats (particularly early successional sites) are important biodiversity resources. There is increasing development pressure on brownfield sites and therefore to ensure sustainability every effort should be made to retain and/or recreate this habitat within the site. Green/brown roofs also have long-term financial benefits related to insulation and increased water proofing longevity and sustainable water management.
1108	18	Consideration should also be given to the introduction of street lighting and security lighting into what is currently a dark environment and what implications this may have for roosting and foraging bats in the area. Where lighting is permitted, as may be necessary for public safety, conditions should be imposed to ensure the impact of the lighting on the bats is kept to a minimum. <i>'The use of a lighting design computer program that predicts where light will fall should be used to predict the potential impact and to plan mitigation for bats. Lighting should be directed to where it is needed and light spillage avoided. No bat roost (including access points) should be directly illuminated and lighting should be avoided adjacent to existing or potential bat commuting and foraging areas. If it is considered necessary to illuminate a building known to be used by roosting bats, the lights should be positioned to avoid the sensitive areas.'</i> This can be achieved by the choice of lighting and by using accessories such as hoods, cowls, louvers and shields to direct the light to the intended area only. Planting can also be used as a barrier or manmade features that are required within the build can be positioned so as to form a barrier.
1108	19	Ideally, we would wish to see as much of the LWS retained within the redeveloped Firbeck Colliery site. If the whole of the LWS requires remediation then clarification would be required as to how this would affect the proposed mitigation scheme and whether, for example, material can be translocated to the receptor site. The suggestion of the adjacent 'pit top' acting as a receptor site would appear to be a good one because Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) owns this site and already have a mechanism in place for managing the site as part of the adjacent Langold Country Park and can therefore make a commitment to management in the long term. However, we would need to be provided with formal confirmation of the council's agreement to this and that sufficient funding and appropriate mechanisms are in place to deliver the mitigation strategy.
1108	20	The redevelopment of Firbeck Colliery yard will inevitably result in an increased recreational pressure on Langold Country Park by new residents. We encourage Bassetlaw District Council to enter into discussion with the County Council to discuss the possibility of securing the nearby pit tip as protected Greenspace for the local community (not currently highlighted as potential protected greenspace). The former pit tip area has existing nature conservation value and by establishing stronger links with Langold CP it will help to mitigate for the anticipated increase in footfall.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1108	21	Misterton sites 89, 92, 93, 201 and 260 are adjacent to the Chesterfield Canal LWS and there is therefore, potential for negative impacts on water vole. Water vole is now fully protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. It is clearly not the intention of the law to prevent all development, management or maintenance works in areas used by water voles. However, legal protection does require that due attention is paid to the presence of water voles and appropriate actions are taken to avoid committing offences. If it can be demonstrated that any action that would otherwise have been an offence was the ‘incidental result of a lawful operation and could not reasonably have been avoided’, this constitutes a defence against prosecution under the Act. This defence thus provides for the carrying out of works that intentionally but incidentally commit offences, such as damaging water vole burrows, but requires that reasonable steps are taken to avoid any unnecessary damage. Only a court can decide what is ‘reasonable’ in any set of circumstances, but, clearly, agreement between the appropriate conservation agencies (Natural England and the Environment Agency), planners and developers would be important. There is, therefore, an obligation on those who maintain waterways to ensure that appropriate systems are in place to minimise damage and that all reasonable ways of avoiding that damage are used. Developers, or other riparian owners, who wish to maintain, build on or alter areas used by water voles must also ensure that unnecessary damage is avoided and all reasonable steps are taken to minimise impacts on water voles or their burrows. This can best be achieved by undertaking a water vole survey at an appropriate time prior to planning any work and ensuring that appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures are included in the proposals. This is only a general guide to the main provisions of the law, not a definitive interpretation. The Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 should be consulted for further details.
1108	22	There should be a criteria-based assessment of Gypsy and traveller sites in order to robustly screen potential sites (as in the SHLAA) to avoid adverse ecological impacts. Have a policy that requires a protected species survey and proposed mitigation to be submitted with the planning application (i.e. a pre-determination protected species survey). For bats (a species given full protection under Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (formerly the Conservation (Natural Habitats & c.) Regulations 1994) the three tests need to be considered. Conditions must be placed on planning consents to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are carried out. This should include follow up surveys to assess the effectiveness of the mitigation work. Planning conditions should be used to replace lost bird breeding sites (e.g., provision of barn owl nest box) and ensure that bat roosting opportunities are maintained.
1108	23	General Comments on Green Infrastructure We note that many responders to the consultation indicated a strong preference for green space within their communities, typically sport pitches and amenity space. When considering these requests, we would ask that any additional Green Infrastructure (GI) delivers the widest range of benefits. An obligation upon local authorities and partners to plan, provide and manage a green infrastructure network is made directly in the cross-cutting policy CC8: Green Infrastructure. Specifically, green infrastructure should be planned and managed to deliver the widest range of linked environmental and social benefits, including conserving and enhancing biodiversity and importantly it demands that connected networks of green spaces around new developments are treated as integral to the planning and design process. Green infrastructure is expected to be multi-functional, delivering amongst other things: improved water and flood risk management; and a positive contribution to climate change through adaptation to, and the mitigation of, associated impacts. Biodiversity is to be protected and enhanced, mitigating for the impacts of new development. Local authorities are specifically required to integrate a green infrastructure network into spatial development plans. There is now a significant body of evidence which makes the case for investment in green infrastructure. From a well planned and connected network of parks and open spaces to the planting of street trees and the greening of roofs, green infrastructure can contribute significantly to both economic development and to efforts to encourage healthier and more sustainable lifestyles.
1108	24	General Comments on Brownfield Sites We note that many responders to the consultation indicated a strong preference for the redevelopment of brownfield sites rather than greenfield. This is understandable, because impacts on previously undeveloped land will always appear greater. Brownfield habitats however, (particularly early successional sites), can be important biodiversity resources. There is increasing development pressure on brownfield sites and therefore to ensure sustainability every effort should be made to retain and/or recreate this habitat within a site. We therefore feel there needs to be a criteria based policy to assess the suitability of previously developed land as appropriate and sustainable. Assess the biodiversity of the site through a desktop study of wildlife sites (Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation/Local Wildlife Sites) and protected species, followed by an ecological assessment of the site. Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land (formally called post industrial sites) are a UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority Habitat. Policy 29 of the East Midlands Regional Plan (2009) considers ‘Priorities for Enhancing the Region’s Biodiversity’ and states that Local Authorities should ensure no net loss of BAP habitats and help achieve UK BAP targets. The present target for the management and restoration of urban and post-industrial sites is 3000 ha by 2015. Therefore, there is conflict with this policy if all applications for previously developed land are considered favourably. We support for proposals for re-use of previously developed land outside development boundaries where it will result in the restoration or natural regeneration of the site e.g. sustainable wetlands. However, we feel there should be a presumption against development of brown field land for other types of development, where it has already developed significant nature conservation interest. Often previously developed land that has been left for some years will have developed significant biodiversity value. In Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation under the paragraph Sites of Biodiversity and Geological Conservation Value the following guidance is provided on previously developed land; “The re-use of previously developed land for new development makes a major contribution to sustainable development by reducing the amount of countryside and undeveloped land that needs to be used. However, where such sites have significant biodiversity or geological interest of recognised local importance, local planning authorities, together with developers, should aim to retain this interest or incorporate it into any development of the site.”

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1108	25	General comments on the Community Infrastructure Levy This is a new levy that local authorities in England and Wales can choose to charge on new developments in their area. The money can be used to support development by funding infrastructure that the council, local community and neighbourhoods want – for example, new or safer road schemes, park improvements or a new health centre. It applies to most new buildings and charges are based on the size and type of the new development. We consider that biodiversity should be added to the list. New developments often have direct and indirect impacts on the District's biodiversity (e.g., increased traffic, increased disturbance, light pollution, noise pollution). In some instances it could be appropriate to levy a developer contribution to ensure that there is no net loss of biodiversity. In RSS8, Policy 28: Priorities for the Region's Biodiversity states 'development and implementation of mechanisms to ensure that development results in no net loss of BAP habitats and species and that net gain is achieved'. We believe that the council should develop a Community Infrastructure Levy alongside specific Planning Obligation requirements to help fund biodiversity gain in the district and to help achieve targets set in The East Midlands Regional Plan (2009). When the council is considering any potential impact on the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and the need to mitigate (through the provision of SANGS) a model is provided by the Dorset Heathland Joint DPD, whereby developers contribute towards a fund for the heathlands.
1108	26	General Comments on the pSPA The issue has arisen as to whether the substantial population of nightjar and woodlark in the Sherwood Forest area justify its classification as a Special Protection Area (“SPA”) under the EU Birds Directive, or at least its identification as a potential SPA (“pSPA”). If Sherwood is to be treated as a pSPA, then it is Government policy (in PPS9 paragraph 6) that the potential site should be treated as if it had already been classified. This would have the result, in the case of planning applications in the vicinity of the pSPA, that the provisions of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (formerly the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc.) Regulations 1994) would have to be applied. It is NWT's view that the Sherwood area is at least a pSPA, and we are therefore bound to advise any LPA to that effect. In this case it is for the Council to decide whether or not you agree with NWT's view that the Sherwood Area is to be regarded as a pSPA. If you wish to discuss this particular issues further please do not hesitate to contact Janice Bradley at our Nottingham office.
1109	1	I disagree as there is no call for new houses in the village at this time, there is at the moment a lot of house on the market including new build and no buyers.
1109	2	If things changed I would agree to a small number of houses being built (no more than 11)
1109	3	No as my views on the Yew Tree Road development would not change, I would oppose it strongly
1109	4	Only site suitable for development would be parts of site 249
1109	5	If development of sites 246 and 247 were granted there would be so much congested due to lack of proper access that it would become very dangerous especially Yew Tree Road.
1110	1	I do not agree with the criteria in the Screening Methodology for the village of Elkesley.
1110	2	Option A
1110	3	Yes, but only for first-time buyers (affordable and 2 bedroom bungalows for senior citizens
1110	4	Yes, because Yew Tree Road cannot take anymore vehicles and for the safety of young children travelling to the new play area.
1110	5	Site 248 or 249.
1110	6	Para 2.5 (Page 10) Plot no. 247 is not brownfield but greenfield and is also outside of the development boundary. Para. 2.6, "Suitability of the Site", items 2, 4, 5, and 7 are all against the development of site 247. Para. 2.9 (Page 11) Employment - Elkesley has no potential employment at all. Everyone who works will have to use their own transport. Para. 2.11, This is very true about the village of Elkesley. Para. 2.21 (Page 13) - How can Elkesley be classed as a Rural Service Centre? Para. 2.25 - 'A'. Para. 2.29 (Page 14) - 'A'. Para. 2.30 - Not on greenfield when we have brownfield available. Para. 2.37 and 2.38 (Page 16) - 'R'.
1110	7	Elkesley shouldn't be classed as a Rural Service Centre 1) The pub may be closing; 2)We have no post office; 3)The local shop is only a convenience store and the residents have to travel to larger towns; 4) We would like a communal garden with seats, a bowling green and tennis courts on the greenfield site.
1110	8	Elkesley cannot be classified as a Rural Service Centre. Reasons no post office, the public house could close, the school cannot cope with many pupils, we have no medical services e.g. if anyone has a appointment Bassetlaw hospital how do they get home? on a very sparse bus service, and there is no employment in Elkesley people would have to commute.
1110	9	Yes.
1110	10	No because of reasons stated above. No more social housing for Yew Tree Road,
1110	11	The site off Yew Tree Road is greenfield not brownfield it is also outside the development boundary. The road leading onto this site cannot cope with any more vehicles as the highways stated an estimated 82 vehicles per day.
1110	12	248 and 249
1110	13	No development in Elkesley should even be looked at until the A1 has been sorted out and as you already know new residents would have to commute to their work.
1110	14	Do you already realise we have 20 social houses on Yew Tree Road? I think this is enough
1111	1	An allocation of 11 new homes seems reasonable. There has been new build in the village and these properties have not sold
1111	2	NO
1111	3	Brownfield sites should be priority in building. Shall clusters of say 6-8 houses are preferable to having an estate.
1111	4	The infrastructure of the village needs to be considerable improved such as shops, post office and community facilities for all ages.
1112	1	In answer to all the questions I do not think that anymore houses should be built in Elkesley until the bridge has been completed.
1112	2	Also infrastructure in Elkesley is not up to more housing in its present state i.e. shops, buses, no main gas, main sewage is a problem in parts of the village.
1113	1	I do not believe the village has adequate infrastructure to support new housing.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1113	2	The Junction (N) onto the A1 is already in capable of supporting the volume of traffic. Large lorries and tractors entering into the village occupies both lanes and on a number of occasions I have nearly had an accident. A new housing development in the village would exacerbate the problems.
1113	3	No amenities in the village i.e. schools facilities, shops, post office, facilities for young people, unacceptable public transport service the local of these facilities can add to ant social behaviour.
1113	4	I understand there are 15 properties on the market, some of which have been for sale for some considerable time.
1113	5	Concerns have been made about the ability of the sewage and drainage systems in the village to support the development of additional housing.
1113	6	No
1113	7	If the application for a bio mass plant in the village is successful this could present a potential health hazard to villages, especially infants.
1114	1	For any future development to take place of Yew Tree Road an alternative access must be provided on to Coalpit Lane.
1114	2	All traffic to and from the A1 would add too much pressure on Yew Tree Road and the High Street.
1115	1	The Criteria in the screening methodology would appear to be satisfactory.
1115	2	Except the parishes of shireoaks & Rhodesia should not have been included in the Town of Worksop.
1115	3	This could be disadvantageous to the two villages and their residents in the future for example if they were applying for grant aid for a village project they could be rejected because they are classified as being in a town, along with other similar situations.
1115	4	The town including Shireoaks & Rhodesia should not take on allocations not fulfilled by other areas.
1115	5	The questionnaires completed by residents indicates that they wished only to see small infill sites developed.
1115	6	Sites 26 , 45 and 37 would impact on the village traffic increases on the already congested road through the village .
1115	7	Lack of school places and community facilities.
1115	8	Also they adjoin the A57 bypass and would be very unpleasant to live so close to a heavily traffic road with a constant drove of traffic noise.
1115	9	Site 151 and 218 yielding a max of 70 dwellings would be a maximum residents may except, however the mature trees on these sites, and the south west end of site 218 comprising the remaining area of coach wood should be protected from development.
1115	10	Site 561 is already an employment site it is difficult to see it redeveloped for housing (max 56) it is located between the railway and a canal both above the site level, site development costs would be high.
1115	11	The access road is single vehicle width and where it merges onto Shireoaks Row has been labelled unacceptable by Highways in the recent past due to proximity of level crossing.
1115	12	Site 28 & W6 would be the best option, part of the site adjoins existing housing and part adjoins an existing employment site, it would appear to be a common sense proposal with good road access.
1115	13	Site 195, 343, and w8 would be unacceptable, it would be detrimental to adjoin sensitive countryside.
1115	14	Surface water from roofs, road, and other paving would discharge into the River Ryton intensifying the existing flooding of the River and the flooding of existing village properties which flood now without additional surface water. (this observation was ignored by Planning at the time of the last development)
1115	15	A development of this size would be detrimental to village activities, facilities and the wellbeing of residents.
1115	16	Additional traffic on Shireoaks Common, Shireoaks Row and Shireoaks Road single carriageway road already congested with traffic movement and parking.
1115	17	Development of this site would be against all the comments and concerns of residents questionnaires completed recently.
1115	18	This development would bring the total new dwelling that almost 900 the village could not support this number, shops would be inadequate, no health services, school would be to small community facilities, inadequate roads, drainage and other infrastructure unable to cope.
1115	19	All open space identify should be protected with an every increasing population open space is essential to the wellbeing of people.
1115	20	It is vital that excessive development should not be allowed in Shireoaks and Rhodesia to the detriment of their identity as villages.
1115	21	Question 35 Option A
1115	22	Question 121 Existing sites should be utilised
1115	23	Question 122 Transit and residential pitches should be provided separately.
1116	1	No
1116	2	Question 10 51 and R7 – good access for transport
1116	3	Question 10 489 (use to extend Bracken Lane School), 488, 511
1116	4	Question 10 370 housing good access site 3 and 27 onto London Road main arterial access into Retford Centre and to the South .
1116	5	Development of the sites listed above would have the advantages of accessing the existing road network without contributing to the current bottleneck at Tiln Lane/ Moorgate and also at All Hallows Street, High Street, Goosemoor Lane, in Ordsall.
1116	6	Plus it would keep the disturbance of development to a minimum.
1116	7	Alternatively I would support development of sites 46, 309, 342, 10, 489, 488, 27, 41 and part of 40 (as this land was under water in 2007)

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1116	8	I would also suggest that site 69 would be ideal as a location for a marina/housing development and again, is on a main arterial access road into Retford.
1116	9	51 & R7 these are in close proximity to industrial areas. I would not support sites 259, and R2 as these not close to current industrial locations.
1116	10	51 & R7 these are in close proximity to industrial areas. I would not support sites 259, and R2 as these not close to current industrial locations.
1116	11	The present traffic bottlenecks prevent easy flow of current traffic levels. Additional housing in the North East and South West quadrants of the town will exasperate the situation.
1116	12	Plus the recent and current housing developments have mainly been in the Ordsall area of the town. This has placed stress on the amenities at the centre of Ordsall "Village". There have been no improvements in local services in response to this development and enlargement. A concentration of new housing in a specific location ought to result in additional levels of public services in that area. i.e. an enlarged primary at Bracken Lane.
1116	13	Plus the rent and current housing developments have mainly been in Ordsall area of the town. This has placed stress on the amenities at the centre of Ordsall "village". There has been no improvements in local services in response to this development and enlargement. A concentration of new housing in a specific location ought to result in additional levels of public service in that area. i.e. an enlarged primary at Bracken Lane.
1116	14	Open spaces should be protected where ever possible.
1117	1	We are concerned that the proposed developments for this area, references 488, 489 and 511 as detailed on figure 5.1 page 39 of the Bassetlaw Site Allocations Issues and Options consultation paper, will result in several increasing the problems that already exist in these areas and compounding the problems in the Blackstope Lane area.
1117	2	We have outlined our objections to these developments below: a) flood risk. Flooding has been a problem in the Blackstope Lane, Grove Coach Road, Blackstope Lane areas for many years due in the main to the inadequate capacity of the Retford Beck to cope with the heavy rainfall in its catchments area. In particular, periods in August 2004 and June 2007 nearly ended in several houses being flooded. Unfortunately, the maintenance of Retford Beck by various parties has been virtually non existent for decades and the Beck is now completely silted up in places. We also understand that the culvert under the railway line on the road leading to Little Gringley, through which the Beck flows is inadequate for the flow of water during periods of heavy rain. Several meetings were held in public in 2007, organised by Mr Patrick Mercer (the then MP for Retford) and Mr John Mann (the current MP for Bassetlaw). However, apart from clearing the culvert from the bottom of Trent Street to the River Idle very little has been achieved and the problem still exists. Allowing the proposed developments, would exacerbate this already serious problem, and on these grounds we strongly oppose the proposed developments
1117	3	Traffic generation, road safety and parking provision. With regard to Bracken Lane and to a lesser extent Grove Coach Road, and their egress onto London Road. During peak traffic periods, particularly when children are being transported to and from Bracken Lane School, serious congestion and safety problems are already a major concern in these area. Of particular concern is the junction of Bracken Lane, Thrumpton Lane and London Road (which has been exacerbated by placing the bus stop/pedestrian island in close proximity to the junction and effectively blocking the north bound carriageway when a bus has stopped).
1117	4	Adding to traffic flows through this junction at peak times will make the already very difficult situation extremely dangerous. There have already been several minor accidents/near misses and it is only a matter of time before a serious accident will occur
1117	5	Parking on Bracken Lane is a minor irritation, most people park on their drives, however, at school ingress and egress times, parent parking reduces the road for its whole length to a single carriageway. Unfortunately, most new developments rely n street parking and again this would add to the problem
1117	6	Infrastructure. Bracken Lane narrows to what is basically a single carriageway beyond number 50, and with quite deep ditches on both sides of the road is quite dangerous. Increasing traffic flows resulting from further housing development without improving the roads would be unacceptable
1117	7	With regard to schools, health facilities etc. we are not n a position to comment on the adequacy of these, other than to comment that increasing the population of Retford would normally mean increasing the capacity/efficiency of some, if not all of the public services
1117	8	What does concern us, is the provision of suitable employment for the additional inhabitants. The unemployment position here is already at unacceptable levels
1117	9	Loss of trees, hedges and ecological habitat. Any loss of the above is to be regretted, and should be replaced and if possible improved upon. Most urban developments, unfortunately do not adequately consider these factors and in the main degrade the environment. This need not be the case, one of the better urban developments which are we are ware of is the Worcester Warden Villages where is excess of 20,000 houses were built over 20 or so years, on greenfield sites. Thousands of trees were planted on several large pen areas in the development linked with pedestrian/cycle ways and including children's play areas and small nature serves. Ideally any developments in Retford would take these considerations into account
1117	10	Preferred areas for developments. With regard to the above, we are not in a position to comment on the pros and cons for the various proposed locations, other than the North Road area would appear to have less impact on the existing inhabitants tan most other areas proposed
1118	1	In our view plot 180 is unacceptable due to location of the sewage pumping station, and the stench it gives off.
1118	2	When flooding occurs the outlet flows into the Harworth dyke, which flows into the river Torne.
1118	3	When flooding occur after thunderstorm or heavy rain my house and my sons house incurs flooding as in photographs attached.
1118	4	This is due to surface water drains being inadequate
1118	5	More development in this area would subject us living on Church Walk to more flooding
1118	6	The position of the Church would compromised if houses were built on plot 180
1119	1	In our view plot 180 is unacceptable due to location of the sewage pumping station, and the stench it gives off.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1119	2	When flooding occurs the outlet flows into the Harworth dyke, which flows into the river Torne.
1119	3	When flooding occur after thunderstorm or heavy rain my house and my sons house incurs flooding as in photographs attached.
1119	4	This is due to surface water drains being inadequate
1119	5	More development in this area would subject us living on Church Walk to more flooding
1119	6	The position of the Church would compromised if houses were built on plot 180
1120	1	The risk of flooding may be high
1120	2	However, more importantly, the marshy grasslands to the immediate south of this site (GI ref 2/977) are important as a home to wildlife including certain bird species and is designated a local nature reserve (SINC). Further, the site in question is not only bordered by one SINC but two as it abuts the Chesterfield Canal. The impact of housing on this site and the surrounding lands including the two SINC sites would be devastating to local wildlife. The ability of developers to overcome flooding may be achievable but the cost to the surrounding eco systems would be too high a price to pay as the delicate balance of grassland and water environments that encourages and is a home for existing wildlife eco systems would be destroyed. The Council's Green Infrastructure Plan notes that present of Lapwings and that it is a former breeding ground for snipe and red bank. The environment remains a site suitable for sustaining these species but will not should the site be allowed to be developed for housing.
1120	3	In particular, back gardens adjacent to a SINC would encourage tipping onto the SINC and the actual development, noise, vibrations, dust etc. would harm the wildlife. Housing would result in blocking of sunlight on to the canal area affecting existing species and biological systems. The comments in the report do not take account of these factors
1120	4	The same report mentioned above comment that the site is suitable as it is within a wider residential area. this is not true. The site is on the edge of town but is to the east of the Chesterfield Canal whereas existing development is to the west of the canal. On other words, the canal is a firm and defensible boundary and to extend in it this area will cause urban sprawl in to open countryside thus changing the character and appearance of the landscape and harming wildlife to their detriment while encouraging coalescence with neighbouring Welham. The value of the open fields to the local environment and for the landscape contribution they make in this area has not considered
1120	5	There are other sites that are less (not bordering SINC sites) as defined on the SHLAA allocation plan and these should be considered in front of site 69. For the above reasons I object to the allocation of this important area (site69) for inclusion within the SHLAA housing allocation
1121	1	We are writing to you to confirm our objections to the proposed buildings to be erected across the canal from our house, and one of us will be meeting with you tomorrow night. We are objecting on several counts: 1) the proposed site (site 69) is a haven for wild life. It is a swampy area and as such, supports a wild variety of life. The birds are of many different species, and include herons, barn owls, pheasant, kestrel, together with many other small birds. I have photographic evidence of some of them. There are also deer, a fox, and I believe there is a conservation project to do with water voles too.
1121	2	There are times when there is very definitely surface water on the land, and this is, we believe an area that water drains to. There are already problems in that the houses we live in were built on 'wet land' and they have had to be built up, and have caused considerable distress to certain residents on the original Welham Road. The effect of building more houses on such a flooded area would be to interfere with more natural drainage
1121	3	Although a 'view' is not considered to be of any significance to planners, we accepted an unusually short garden on the understanding that we had the open outlook to compensate for that. The proposed land is very squeezed in by the railway and the canal, and also provides an attractive scene for users of the canal. As the houses would have to be built to, so as to avoid the wet land, and with the current leaning towards building three storey town houses, it would be very likely that we would be 'dwarfed' and in full view of those houses
1121	4	There are currently MANY new built houses for sale in Retford town. I see no need to build more, although you will no doubt tell us that the directive has come from Government. However, in view of the fact that the houses over the way will be jammed in by the railway, and the canal, what would be the point in building these house, when there are so many objections to them? There are clearly already more new properties empty in Retford, in much more attractive settings
1121	5	The Idle Valley Reserve is one of the great significance nationally. Although Retford isn't strictly part of the Reserve, the birds are clearly spotted alongside the canal and river. The number of species identified in this area is somewhere in the region of 175, this being second only to Ryland Water.
1121	6	The access to the houses would presumably be near the Hop Pole. This would lead onto a very busy road.
1122	1	Yes land for development of more than 9 houses should be released
1122	2	Site 266 is owned by my client who wish it to be released for development
1122	3	My clients are prepared to deliver up the site as soon as possible if released for development
1122	4	No Response
1123	1	Mrs Young is concerned that there is a lack of infrastructure to support such large housing developments around Kilton.
1124	1	We feel a town the size of Worksop, which has too few facilities the golf course and land surrounding is a viable resource, used by many, young and old alike with Bridle paths through to Scoften. For that reason alone it should not be built on.
1124	2	Not to mention the loss of the football pitches. Losing yet more open space at a time when the Government are advocating children being more active. Merely having the Canal does not suffice.
1124	3	Concerning the proposed industrial sites, we see no reason to build new ones as there are vacant ones on Claylands Avenue, both Kilton Road Sites and Babbage Way to mention a few.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1124	4	Many of the 'Green Areas' marked on the plans we had were areas including school playing fields and small grassed areas set amongst housing , on which signs state 'NO Ball Games' We cannot see how these areas can be green areas, the only green being grass on them.
1124	5	We cannot express how strongly we oppose the plans to build on site allocation 4. It is our town and home, Worksop doesn't have much going for it, but this area is one. Please don't let it be ruined.
1125	1	The existing store is located to the west of Worksop town centre in a well-established out of centre retail destination and is an integral component of the retail hierarchy of the District. The store provides a complementary role to the town centre of Worksop and is a key shopping facility which serves the needs of the surrounding area. The store has recently been extended in order to enhance its retail offer and improve consumer choice. The store is also a key employer in the local area providing substantial employment opportunities for the local community. The site is in mixed uses accommodating a number of industrial and commercial buildings, a MacDonald's restaurant and a public house is located opposite on Stubbing Lane. The site is well served by public transport with bus stops located immediately outside the store offering transport to the town centre and surrounding residential areas.
1125	2	At the present the SAIAO does not seek to identify any sites for future retail development nor does it recognise and allocate any existing retail sites in the District. The SAIO considers that all future retail development can be accommodated with the existing town centre (namely Worksop and Retford) and a number of smaller local centres. These representations are submitted in order to seek the recognition and allocation of the existing SSL store in Worksop as a sustainable location for future retail development.
1125	3	We respectfully request that the Site Allocations DPD is amended to support further retail development at existing out of centre locations such as the existing SSL store, ahead of other locations and that the SSL be allocated as a retail location in the emerging Plan (subject to those circumstances where the sequential test and impact tests are met).
1126	1	The 'screening approach' should be renamed to stop the confusion with 'screening opinion'.
1126	2	Not all criteria should be weighted the same and it should be recognised that some judgements are subjective and hence it will be for the decision maker to justify their approach by reference to the appropriate evidence base.
1126	3	We agree that the methodology criteria set out in section 2 of the Site Allocations Issues and Options paper is suitable to identify sites for allocation for future development. The following table provides an assessment of site ref: 266 Retford Road, Blyth against the methodology criteria:
1126	4	1) Is the local community supportive of the development of the site? The level of community support is unknown at the present time as no public consultation has been undertaken.
1126	5	2) Will development of the site be compatible with existing and / or proposed neighbouring land uses? Green Compatible with existing and/or proposed neighbouring land uses The allocation of this site for residential purposes would be compatible with the neighbouring residential land uses particularly to the south
1126	6	3) Will the site help deliver economic development opportunities? Not applicable
1126	7	4) Will the site result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land? Green No Impact on agricultural land The site is currently grassland used only for grazing
1126	8	5) Will the site impact on a water Source Protection Zone? Green Not a Source Protection Zone The site does not fall within such a protection zone.
1126	9	6) Will the site impact negatively on Landscape Character? Green No negative impact on Landscape Character The site is located on the northern boundary of the settlement and outside the conservation area to the south.
1126	10	7) Will the development detract from or enhance the existing built character of the settlement or neighbourhood? Green Enhancement to the built character of the settlement Development of a small scale housing scheme utilising quality architecture will enhance the northern boundary of the settlement.
1126	11	8) Will the development detract from or enhance the existing Green Infrastructure of the settlement or neighbourhood? Amber Some loss of green infrastructure Although development of the site will result in some loss of green infrastructure, this site does not represent high quality open or recreational space neither is it considered of high ecological value.
1126	12	9) Are there identified and unresolved constraints to the delivery of the site? Green No identified and unresolved constraints There are no constraints on the site that cannot be resolved. Access in particular has been considered and there are no particular issues that would prevent development.
1126	13	The numbers proposed for each settlement do not appear to have been based on a robust evidence base and have relied on what local residents think should be accommodated in their individual settlement. DLP have assessed each of the settlements and suggested a housing requirement based on the percentage population of each service centre against the total population for all rural service centres. The distribution of housing requirement is set out in Table 2 below. It is therefore considered that in the case of East Markham, land should be allocated for at least 24 new houses. This level of housing development is considered to be commensurate with the size of the settlement and it appears that our client's site could accommodate this number of dwellings.
1126	14	The 2011 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment identifies 518 dwellings which are developable in the 6-10 year period of the plan and 91 units in the 11-15 year period for East Markham. The figures provided in the 2011 SHLAA for deliverable sites within the first 5 years of the plan for East Markham is 41 units. This is provided on site ref: 196, an edge of settlement brownfield site. However, the proposed outline scheme for 41 dwellings on this site under ref: 16/10/00047 is pending the completion of a legal agreement and therefore there is no extant planning permission on this site to contribute towards the 5 year supply of housing. The delegated target date for this application was 21/12/2010 and no legal agreement has been signed to date. Therefore it is considered that the sites allocated within East Markham should compensate for this shortfall for the settlement together with the 24 units as indicated above, therefore totalling 65 units to be provided during the plan period. The Site Allocation Issues and Options paper identifies 22 sites in East Markham as 'Potential Housing' with a total maximum capacity of 660 units. This level of housing clearly goes beyond the supply for the plan period and could not be accommodated without significant investment into additional infrastructure and services. Therefore the most suitable, deliverable and achievable sites within the SHLAA need to be selected in order to ensure the successful delivery of housing growth on the most sequentially preferable sites.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1126	15	Although the Core Strategy does make provision for the boundaries of settlements to be changed in order to accommodate site allocations, it is considered that sites within the settlement boundary should be considered favourable to come forward over the plan period should they be suitable for residential development. Only 1 of the 22 sites is located within the existing settlement boundary and the site's suitability is summarised below.
1126	16	This site is offices and wasteland and is surrounded by residential development to the north, south and west. To the east is open countryside. The capacity of the site is 8 dwellings and access would be taken from Beckland Hill to the west.
1126	17	There is a committed housing site to the south of the site ref: 196, which is the single site identified in the SHLAA as part of the 5 years housing land supply for 41 dwellings. The legal agreement remains pending on this application and so the delivery of the site is uncertain. However, if this site is not delivered it does not prevent the development of site ref: 145 in terms of access for example.
1126	18	The remaining required housing supply for the plan period would need to be allocated outside the settlement boundary. The preferred site for the remaining provision is site ref: 142 located to the north of High Street on the northern side of the settlement. The site has a capacity of 47 dwellings and therefore should this site be allocated would ensure compensations for any shortfall in the delivery of the above mentioned sites should these not be deliverable.
1126	19	The site would achieve a suitable access point from High Street and adequate visibility could be achieved along this highway.
1126	20	The site lies outside of the conservation area whilst remaining connected to the wider residential area of the settlement.
1126	21	The owners of the site are known and the site is available for development.
1126	22	The above preferred edge of settlement site together with the site located within the settlement (ref: 145) brings the total preferred capacity of future housing supply for East Markham to 55. This figure is above the 11 units required in the Site Allocations paper and the 24 units set out in the table above. However, this higher figure is considered to address the shortfall over the plan period together with the potential non-delivery of site ref: 196.
1126	23	We are in support of the allocation of those sites identified as suitable and located within the settlement boundary of East Markham.
1126	24	Site ref: 196 is not considered to be guaranteed for delivery given the length of time that has past with no legal agreement signed or decision notice issued. Therefore there is a shortfall of 41 dwellings. This shortfall will need to be compensated for during the plan period.
1126	25	Furthermore an assessment of the distribution across the Rural Service Centre settlements has been carried out based on their size and population. It has been assessed that East Markham should be allocating land for at least 26 new dwellings.
1126	26	Therefore a total of 65 (41+24) units should be allocated within the settlement of East Markham. To compensate for the shortfall site ref: 142 is considered to be suitable, achievable and available for residential development during the plan period. There are no constraints to developing this site for residential dwellings. The site is located outside the conservation area and adjacent the settlement boundary and is considered to be a suitable allocation to deliver the remaining housing required in East Markham. We therefore support the allocation of site ref: 142 and the amendments to the settlement boundary to accommodate this site.
1127	1	Yes the criteria are broad ranging.
1127	2	No. It is dubious whether more housing/employment growth would benefit the town as there are so many great shopping areas in Sheffield, Doncaster and Chesterfield which would be hard to compete with.
1127	3	I would prefer housing to be built near sites with the existing infrastructure to support it. E.g. 343, 195 28 26 & 90
1127	4	Also sites that do not encroach on the surrounding countryside and open spaces which people and wildlife enjoy.
1127	5	The sites 26/28 and 343/195 could also support some employment along with site W6.
1127	6	Yes they should. Our open spaces are important for our well-being, whether to look at, spend time in and for the huge amount of dog walkers that would otherwise have to get into their cars to find open spaces in turn generating more traffic that Worksop can ill afford. The few pockets of open spaces provide corridors for wildlife to live and move around. They are welcome areas for children to go to for a game or walk near their homes. We do not want our children to be brought up in a concrete environment.
1127	7	Site 35 seems to have been suggested but seems to contravene point 2.6 Sites for Suitability from the Consultation paper. It is adjacent to local wildlife sites (which have only just had many species of bird return after the last round of building), will involve the destruction of valuable hedgerows and a great loss of Biodiversity in the area. It has a poor road network which is already under pressure as the area was forced to have new homes built.
1127	8	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1127	9	Existing sites - as per the discussion at the meeting, no new areas are needed.
1128	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1128	2	No. I believe the number of houses residents have indicated they would like to see in the Future Development Questionnaire (FDQ) survey was for up to 10 new houses (27%, the most popular response), the next most popular response was for no new housing (23%). I would support 10 new houses over the plan period.
1128	3	I would support a small development of 10 houses on site 505 adjacent to the existing row of bungalows with access off Station Road.
1128	4	I would not support development on site 504 as part of this site (adjacent to the old railway line) is old, species rich pasture of merit to the habitats within the village.
1128	5	I would not support development on sites 506 and 383 as access is via existing bridleways/footpaths which are in frequent daily use by walkers and riders etc. The increase in vehicular traffic to such developments would be hazardous to existing users.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1128	6	I do not support development on site 480 Misson Mill. The economics of clearing the site of asbestos buildings, hard standing etc. would mean that only a very large housing development would be viable. The site can accommodate 212 houses, yet the current village has only 303. Development of this site would be completely out of proportion to the village and alter it's nature. The positive aspects of the village are it's tranquil, rural relative isolation with a number of important historical & heritage buildings.
1128	7	No. The existing economic area, Misson Mill, should be retained for economic and employment development only.
1128	8	The lack of infrastructure of all kinds would not support any major development of any kind, housing or economic. The noxious odours from Tunnel Tech mean that any development, economic or housing, would subject more people to the health & well-being risks the odour poses - if you could get them to buy in the first place. If they do buy they won't be able to sell...!
1128	9	Yes, they are all very important to the character of the village and enjoyment of residents.
1128	10	In addition to the village green and school playing field the churchyard, cemetery and pinfold should be protected.
1129	1	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1129	2	Yes
1129	3	Misson Mill, Site Ref 480 is preferred for future development.
1129	4	Misson Parish Council consider sites 504, 505 & 506 to be unsuitable for housing development for the following reasons: These sites represent attractive village green space which the Parish Plan identifies as important to residents living in Misson – “A very special rural environment surrounded by attractive countryside and enhanced by the River Idle”. The FDQ identified the following local characteristics as special and in need of protection: Rural village, that is not isolated; Surrounded by green fields.
1129	5	The sites are outside the Development Boundaries and as such will have an adverse impact on the countryside and go against Policy DM3. The majority of residents responding to the FDQ survey (over 75%) said the Council should prioritise brownfield land for new development.
1129	6	The value of village green spaces, rural aspect and scale of development were points the parish council made to BDC Planning Team at the first stage SHLAA consultation in October 2010. They have since been endorsed by the results of the FDQ resident survey. As such these aspects should have been taken into account when producing this next draft proposal & the sites identified as ‘not developable’.
1129	7	Misson Parish Council have the following concerns over the suitability of site 383 for housing development: The site represents attractive village green space which the Parish Plan identifies as important to residents living in Misson – “A very special rural environment surrounded by attractive countryside and enhanced by the River Idle”. The FDQ identified the following local characteristics as special and in need of protection: Rural village, that is not isolated; Surrounded by green fields
1129	8	The site is outside the Development Boundaries and as such will have an adverse impact on the countryside and go against Policy DM3. The majority of residents responding to the FDQ survey (over 75%) said the Council should prioritise brownfield land for new development.
1129	9	The value of village green spaces, rural aspect and scale of development were points the parish council made to BDC Planning Team at the first stage SHLAA consultation in October 2010. They have since been endorsed by the results of the FDQ resident survey.
1129	10	Misson Parish Council support the allocation of site 480 for mixed use development. Misson Mill site currently provides valuable business units and employment, particularly to local residents. It provides the only commercial facilities where residents can buy food & hard goods, and make use of services such as vehicle repair, fabrication and cafe facilities. These are vital services for the village as it has a limited public transport service to reach outlying towns. As a result Misson PC wish to see the site continue to offer economic opportunities to local residents. Misson PC would like any future development to accommodate any existing tenants should they wish it, and to ensure that their rents remain affordable in line with the current rental for a suitable period of adjustment.
1129	11	With regard to the development of housing on the site Misson Parish Council would support up to a maximum of 40 housing units. Of these a suitable number should be affordable housing to meet the needs identified in the residents questionnaire of homes for first time 'buyers' and sheltered accommodation for the elderly. Misson PC are aware that the owners of the site may propose many more housing units but residents have clearly expressed a wish for very limited housing growth over the plan period. The number of houses residents have indicated they would like to see in the Future Development Questionnaire (FDQ) survey were: The most popular response was for up to 10 new houses (27%); The next most popular response was for no new housing (23%). Misson PC believe 40 new houses would be a reasonable compromise.
1129	12	Should this site be developed Misson PC would also expect it to include a village amenity e.g. play space & recreation ground that are desperately needed in the village & will be in greater demand should the number of residents increase.
1129	13	Please see points made above. In addition Misson has very limited infrastructure - there is no mains gas so heating options are expensive and limited; broadband is very slow and is a drawback to new businesses and the self-employed homeworkers; the drainage system already causes problems in some parts of the village with flooded roads after heavy rain; the school is at or near full capacity and has already extended.
1129	14	Yes they should be protected.
1129	15	MPC & Residents have identified the following green spaces as particularly valuable: village green; village pinfold (off village green); churchyard; cemetery; school playing field.
1130	1	We do agree with most of the criteria in the screening methodology

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1130	2	with the exception of Criterion 4 which involves the loss of agricultural land to development. We believe all agricultural land should be exempt as far as possible, agricultural land should only be developed as a last resort; once developed it is lost to food production. At the very least PPS7 should be strictly adhered to, and grade 3 land should be grouped with grades 1 and 2 where evidence is not provided as to which subdivision it falls into.
1130	3	We do not believe that any additional housing above that already required is necessary. We are concerned at the number of existing industrial units that are standing empty.
1130	4	In Rhodesia we would prefer to see site 38 developed as this is a brownfield site with existing access and egress onto Shireoaks Road. This site is the subject of a current planning application to provide 80 dwellings and a residential care home. The care home would also provide some employment.
1130	5	If further development is required in Rhodesia, site 90 should be developed in preference to site 30. It has direct road access onto Tylden Road, leading to Shireoaks Road.
1130	6	Traffic from site 30 would have to pass through the existing housing estate and probably past the primary school in order to leave the village.
1130	7	Site 30 adjoins Lady Lee Nature Reserve and provides a buffer zone between it and the existing housing and should surely be left as a continuous green corridor alongside bridleway no.2 which runs from Haggonfields to Manor Lodge.
1130	8	If each of the proposed sites (30,38 and 90) were developed for housing this would almost double the size of the village (92.7% increase:- existing houses 411, proposed further houses 381). Surely there is inadequate infrastructure to support this total.
1130	9	With regard to site no.9, the proposed development extends to the boundary of the grounds of Manor Lodge - a Grade 1 listed building. Manor Lodge is missing from the map supplied as figure 4.1, sheet 25 of your consultation documents despite being, as an Elizabethan hunting lodge, the tallest historical building in Worksop.
1130	10	Site 9 is also highly productive agricultural land which maintains, enhances and preserves the rural setting and public visual amenity of this important landmark.
1130	11	Bridleway 2 from Haggonfields continues as bridleway 18 from Manor Lodge to Mansfield Road along the western boundary of site 9; footpath 2 crosses site 9. Many people (ramblers, cyclists, horse riders, dog walkers) value access to the rural aspect of this area and the wildlife living within it, and this proposed development would be detrimental to this amenity and be incompatible with the existing land use which is agricultural.
1130	12	Development of site 9 would also generate serious traffic issues -Mansfield Road, the A60 is congested at present with queuing traffic at peak times extending past the proposed site. Further development would provide major traffic congestion and road safety issues for those using public transport on Mansfield Road.
1130	13	Planning department employees have stated that any housing development on this site would require an additional primary school located on the site. This would surely exacerbate traffic and road safety issues even more.
1130	14	The development would also result in the loss of privacy to the existing houses on Mansfield Road and those houses on the St. Anne's estate which adjoin site 9.
1130	15	We would prefer to see sites W1, and W12 developed for employment in the future
1130	16	We were surprised to see W13 proposed for development of any kind, located as it is between the River Ryton and the Canal, regularly seen to have crops standing in water, we feel it is an unsuitable location.
1130	17	We have no preferences but would hope that adequate provision is included for protected open spaces both within the housing development part of the mixed use sites and between the housing and the employment land.
1130	18	Any open space is a valuable resource to the local community and should be protected as far as possible.
1130	19	We do not feel able to comment about this without far more information.
1130	20	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1130	21	We consider it makes sound financial and economic sense in the present climate to extend and improve existing sites rather than provide new sites.
1130	22	We consider transit and residential pitches should be provided together for financial, economic and logistical reasons.
1131	1	I don't agree that the criteria sufficiently takes into account community growth and the adverse effects i.e. increase in crime rate thus increasing the insurance premiums of the existing local community. Consultation with the communities affected(site 35) has been poor and a greater effort should be made i.e. letters, door to door surveys even if this at the constructors risk. Development in site 35 would saturate the local infrastructure where traffic and through traffic already causes issues in the morning rush hour.
1131	2	I believe that existing inner city land should be developed to regenerate the deprived local areas and not a financial driven decision to grow areas that already have the highest council tax rate in the town.
1131	3	Site gives good potential for direct links to the A1 and would develop east side community providing Schools and Shops would be advantageous to that community.
1131	4	Site 4
1131	5	Site 4 due to its locality to the A1. Mixed use segregated by recreational land.
1131	6	I believe site 35 should be a protected area as we have a responsibility to protect areas of natural beauty and of historical importance.
1131	7	The de Gatefold family were known precede in the area local to site 35 in the time of Edward III.
1131	8	The existing infrastructure could not support any development on the west side of the town. The A57 West bound is regularly backing up from the Todwick crossroads well into South Anston. The addition of housing on the west side of the town would only compound this problem. The rush our traffic on Ashes Park avenue often queues over the brow of the hill down to towards the roundabout and adding up to 700 houses approximately 1000 vehicles can only make the situation worse.
1131	9	the average age of the residents of Gateford is 39 years old which means that if this demographic was to continue the local primary school could not accommodate.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1131	10	The local shopping precinct is already a problem for parking and traffic since the Asda store opened and this would almost certainly be made worse by a local housing development.
1131	11	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1131	12	REMOVED
1131	13	Separate, allows the residential pitches to build community spirit.
1132	1	I agree with the screening methodology.
1132	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1132	3	I disagree, I feel that more than 14 properties are required for the needs of the community over the next 16 yrs. I suggest 25.
1132	4	294
1132	5	I have land that I would like considered I will send in the details.
1132	6	I think that the school should have more land.
1132	7	The village hall should have a play area .
1132	8	There should be more housing for first time buyers and young families. There are too many old people in the village we need to balance it out.
1132	9	I think the open spaces identified on the map should be protected, although I think the current recreation area is fine for sports and older children I do not think it is in a good position for younger children.
1132	10	I do not have an informed opinion, I am aware of problems in Gringley on the hill with a traveller family who resided there and realise their culture can cause conflict and finding suitable areas to avoid this conflict needs to be addressed.
1132	11	I imagine that providing the Gypsies and travellers with a combination that suits their needs would be best.
1133	1	Yes
1133	2	No – Not above what has already been committed at this stage.
1133	3	If development has to be in Retford we would suggest areas 384/41/40/52/1. Housing in this area would be most suitable because of the direct access to the A1 leading to major town Worksop, Sheffield, Doncaster, Newark, Grantham where most residents would shop as Retford's main roads and shopping cannot take any more pressure.
1133	4	Site's 259 & R2 would be best for businesses with close proximity to the A1 & small airport which could be an advantage to attract business into the area, which would be in great need if Retford is expanded with housing.
1133	5	Opening up the relief road (completing ring road) needs serious consideration and should have been looked at before planning was given to area around 1/81 as this could have been a possibility. Retford has a serious congestion problem already even before all committed housing projects are completed and the emergency services must already be affected by this.
1133	6	Yes, if any are required for development I would go with 1/21 1/23
1133	7	B – I think Retford might require services as most have been taken away.
1133	8	Existing sites
1133	9	Together – to keep communities together.
1134	1	I disagree that land should be allocated for at least 12 new houses. The current infrastructure is inadequate (roads, sewerage/drainage, and public transport) to cope with any building over and above windfall/infill development.
1134	2	If there were to be any building it should be limited to 6 dwellings of no more than 2 bedrooms to provide accommodation for 1st time buyers/retirees.
1134	3	The only site which should be considered is 239 and then road frontage development only on Low Street and Retford Road.
1134	4	The other sites have neither suitable/acceptable access nor drainage.
1134	5	Without significant infrastructure investment especially in the drainage system, any development will be problematic because it will overload even more an already inadequate system.
1134	6	Yes
1134	7	There is no suitable land available North or South Wheatley for such development.
1135	1	12 new houses is too many. The present infrastructure is not adequate to cope with any new buildings. The roads, sewerage, drainage are already overloaded. The public transport service is limited.
1135	2	6 new dwellings would be more than enough and these should be bungalows of 2 bedrooms for 1st time buyers or downsizing/retirees.
1135	3	Only consider site 239 and limit this to road frontage development only i.e. Low St and Retford Rd.
1135	4	All other sites have no suitable access of adequate infrastructure.
1135	5	The infrastructure in Wheatley is already overloaded i.e. drainage, sewerage – we have problems now so just think what would happen. The cost to put this right for development purposes would be very high and not necessarily successful.
1135	6	Yes yes!
1135	7	No there is no suitable land for such development in North or South Wheatley.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1136	1	I agree with this. The village needs to grow in a small way to continue to make It a sustainable community Supporting school, shop, public house, rural businesses etc. 12 is a sensible number providing the sewerage system can be Improved to cope
1136	2	The housing planned should be aimed at young families to keep the village moving forward
1136	3	Parts of Sites 236 & 237 would be the most suitable as they are already accessible by roads and connected to the services.
1136	4	Part of 239 would be suitable up to the road side (Low Street) but some is not very accessible and can flood.
1136	5	238 floods but that may be possible to overcome
1136	6	464 has very limited access and would encroach badly on present dwellings and I feel is unsuitable.
1136	7	I believe 12 houses if they were of the correct size spread between 236, 237 and 239 would be the most sensible option.
1136	8	I believe it is very important for any housing to be affordable for young families, perhaps 3 or 4 bedroom semi detached properties similar to St Helens Rise. There has been far too much development in the village that have been big detached properties that are out of the price range of young couples wanting to stay in the village and young families wanting to move into the village.
1136	9	I feel it would be a shame if 36/2 & 36/1 were given planning as open throughout the village is important, however it is private property.
1136	10	36/5 I think is cared for by the Parish Council so I believe any development here should again be aimed at affordable housing.
1136	11	Areas 36/3, 36/4, 36/6, 36/7 should be fully protected as these are the Village recreation areas and under no circumstances should they be developed
1136	12	I believe all future development should be aimed towards enabling the village to prosper without it becoming too built up.
1137	1	We totally agree that this area is in need of further development. This is an excellent location with employment from Cottam and West Burton power station. The current policy to upgrade West Burton to include gas will require a further 50 employees who locally based would minimize the carbon foot print to which the government recommends.
1137	2	Site ref no. 165.
1137	3	The above site is suitable for either 15-50 houses to suit the council's requirements. The site has access to an adopted highway on to Southgore Lane with provisional access to Turners Croft and the Maltkins
1137	4	The village is served with public transport, local shop, primary school, garage, Dr's surgery, playing field, church and chapel.
1137	5	There is a main gas supply directly through the village suitable to feed off Southgore Lane to the site.
1137	6	This site has never been used for agricultural services during the last 45 years.
1137	7	We agree there should be protected open spaces within the village as set out in the Development Framework November 2011.
1138	1	The land in question has always been subject to periodic flooding, it has to absorb all the water run off from Grove hills, which is a natural occurrence and many properties in this area suffer from flooding because of this. Elderly residents of Retford recall some of these fields being used for ice skating on during the winter months many years ago; it has always been very wet land, not suitable for building on. The fields resemble marshland many months of the year; some are only used for cattle grazing not suitable for arable crops, too wet. We would like to refer you to a property on Grove Coach road, number 55 which on many occasions has flooded right through the house causing much damage to most of the resident's contents, they are now faced with huge insurance renewal premiums because of this, let alone all the stress and upset it caused all the family. The same property has flooded at least three times over the last twenty years. We happen to know the people that lived in number 55 thirty years ago and they experienced flooding back then, we understand the lady in question has forwarded to you photographs of her son aged about nine in a canoe on their back garden, he is now over forty. As you are fully aware, this is not the only property that floods, many other properties on St Stephen's and St Helen's road are also affected during prolonged spells of rain. In the floods of June 2007 many properties on Cavendish road had garages flooded and lost personnel belongings due to water damage, we ourselves were millimetres away from water entering our house, having spent most of the day trying to pump water away but it had nowhere to go, we felt it necessary to block off the road with a vehicle to stop passing traffic making the situation worse. (Photographs enclosed showing the junction of Grove Coach road and Cavendish road, & resident's gardens). People could not run baths or flush toilets due to all the drainage system being overloaded. Many children on this estate are restricted as to when they can play in their gardens due to lawns being waterlogged. We would like to quote from the 1996 report of an independent enquiry into certain planning related issues within the Bassetlaw area by RW Phelps CBE MA stating that the council should delete provisional allocation of land at Grove Coach road and Bracken Lane from the deposit version of the local plan, he also stated the site has a history of periodic flooding and likely to expose residents to unacceptable risks and also increase the risk of flooding further downstream as the site is a poorly drained area. This proved to be true when in 2007 many properties flooded in this area and also Blackstope lane was very badly affected, nearly every bungalow was flooded, residents out of their properties for almost a year whilst things could be put right. The report also stated that strong objection from The National Rivers Authority and Highway Authority that any development for housing would propose some difficult problems, page 29. The site was obviously unsuitable for development for technical reasons, flooding in particular which would be exacerbated by further development and to tackle the problem of flooding would cost over one million, it would be unreasonable to any developer to spend that type of money. What would the cost be now some fifteen years later? and would it prove successful. He also stated the council could be liable because it had known that the flooding problems existed, and recommended any outline planning consent should be overturned. Since 1996 the situation has not changed, we still flooded in 2007. Is it fair to put people through this terrible ordeal? when there are other sites more suitable in other areas of Retford which do not flood? It is difficult to put forward our suggestions to what area of Retford would be suitable for future development, we feel too much building has taken place over the last few years and Retford is looking very congested.
1138	2	There are other concerns such as: a new school would have to be built to accommodate the children,

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1138	3	Additional vehicles using the estate roads, many of them not suitable for excessive traffic, already a problem on entering London road.
1139	1	I think industrial development should come first for the unemployed. Then more industry & housing for growth of the town, how much I don't know.
1139	2	If it's all going to be used does it matter which is used first.
1139	3	Some leisure facilities would be good mix with employment
1139	4	Open spaces are of great importance in my view and think all sites should be protected.
1139	5	I would like to bring to your attention the land at the back of Alexandra Road as I understand this is a bird sanctuary but is not (according to your map) protected. I would like to see this land protected as there is a wonderful array of bird and wildlife in this small piece of land.
1140	1	It is noted that the Council '..... is currently assessing the quality and value of open spaces in the District' -is this in addition to the PPG 17 study by K, K & P in March 2010? The County Council owns and manages a significant number of open spaces in the District. It supports the District's intention to assess the stock and seeks to be actively involved in the process. Pending completion of the assessment, the District has identified most urban greenspace as '..... Potential Protected Open Space' and included significant built development within the identified areas. Whilst such definition may be provisional or indicative, County Property would object to this technique remaining at the next stage of the plan. It is generally accepted convention and a practical graphic technique that justified open space protection policies do not 'wash over' buildings, car parks, service areas and related amenity space. County Property would be willing to assist Bassetlaw in making the appropriate distinction for the relevant sites in its ownership. Any policy aimed at protecting open spaces should recognise the need to secure enduring management and, in the case of play space, appropriate infrastructure e.g. changing rooms.
1140	2	Land at Shireoaks Marina (Site 153) County Property has on going feasibility work to ascertain optimum land use budget. Fresh proposals for development will be produced later in the year.
1140	3	Greenacre Day Centre 1 Wincroft Hostel, Wingfield Avenue, Prospect Hill, Worksop. These two sites are surplus to County Council requirements. The 'Protected Open Space' notation is inappropriate. The grass and trees on the site are part of amenity landscape related to the existing buildings and uses. The space is not 'public'. The site features should be considered as part of the design of any new development. DELETE - 'protected open space' designation.
1140	4	Holies Street Resource Centre, off Newgate Street, Worksop The only 'space' at this site is private amenity landscape. The 'Protected Open Space' designation is inappropriate. DELETE - 'protected open space' designation.
1140	5	Lincoln Street, Worksop There is an inconsistency in the designation of 'protected open space' on this site as between the Approved Local Plan 2001 and this Consultation -see also County Property's generic representation.
1140	6	Land at Bracken Lane, Retford County Property has surplus land off Bracken Lane which should be considered as an option for development to east of Retford. It may be appropriate to consider in conjunction with other identified sites (e.g. 4/88 and 4/89)
1141	1	We objected please don't take Kilton Golf Course.
1142	1	The number of dwellings allocated. Should be that set out in table 10.2 to allow villages to grow.
1142	2	I agree enough land should be allocated in Wheatley for at least 12 new houses.
1142	3	Parts of sites 236 and 237 would be most suitable as they are connected to the services and accessible by road already.
1142	4	Site 239 floods as in 2007 this whole field was under water.
1142	5	Site 238 floods as well
1142	6	Site 464 has poor access, would also spoil the character of the village.
1142	7	Infilling between has already spoiled some of the village more would spoil it more.
1143	1	Figures provided in the above document should provide sufficient housing and employment needs for the future.
1143	2	The proposed developments adjacent to the road network and public transport facilities should have a more urgent consideration i.e. numbers 8,9,11,14,26,28,30,35,39,153,195.
1143	3	Sites W1, W12 and W13 These proposals are adjacent to good roads and public transport and therefore should be a major consideration.
1143	4	Mixed usage on sites 39/W10, 28/W6, 195/W8 which are again adjacent to good services should be a major consideration.
1143	5	Open spaces indicated on the plan should be preserved for children to play and members of the public to exercise
1143	6	I would object strongly to the Kilton Forest Golf Course being used for housing development and any development on site 4 & W9.
1143	7	Living adjacent to the above I know how many members of the community enjoy using the public rights of way to exercise dogs and enjoy the openness of the countryside for recreational purposes. Any development on 4 & W9 would be detrimental to the area due to:-
1143	8	1.Road access and poor infrastructure.
1143	9	2. Loss of trees and hedgerows.
1143	10	3. Impact of public visual amenity.
1144	1	Yes

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1144	2	Flooding is one of the things you list as to a reason why you would remove certain areas during your screening process. Areas 511, 370, 489, 488 & 69 are known locally to be areas which have water problems, most of the year they are boggy with surface water and the areas which back onto St Helens & St Stephens flood. During severe weather surface water from the nearby higher ground (Grove) has caused flooding in gardens/houses.
1144	3	No more houses for Retford other than the proposed extra 500.
1144	4	Larger companies need to be attracted to our town to give employment opportunities, over the years employers have been lost (Bridon, Clarks, Jenkins) and nothing of a similar size has replaced them.
1144	5	I would prefer to see housing development in areas which have no flood/water problems and more importantly have no access.
1144	6	Sites 51, 40, 52, 1, 37, 41 & 27 seem to have none of these problems.
1144	7	I strongly object to areas being included that have known problems with flooding and poor road systems and access – areas such as 69, 511, 370, 488, 489.
1144	8	Employment land is desperately needed and I have no objections to either area being allocated.
1144	9	No preference
1144	10	Your publicity about this consultation needs to be more open and visible.
1144	11	Green areas should be protected.
1144	12	Option A
1144	13	They should be concentrated in and around existing sites – this makes sense economically
1144	14	Should be together, cheaper to provide.
1145	1	It has come to my attention that North and South Wheatley is to be considered for a further 12 houses. We have a number of friends who live in the village and have always admired it as it is a lovely rural area where planning have been sensitive in allowing developments.
1145	2	I am aware of the plots in offer and would like to express my support for no 236 on Top Pasture Lane and to the field at the back of Whitegates, which runs alongside this plot. The two paddocks are well maintained with water and electricity available. In addition there is plenty of room for parking and private gardens allowing nice individual developments to take place, which would be in keeping with the village. It would also mean minimal disturbance for any of the local residents and maintain the ambience of the village as a whole.
1146	1	I can confirm that I approve of the twelve houses over the next seventeen years.
1146	2	I would also like to express my preference of small houses for couples and young families and for first refusal to be offered to existing village residents where possible.
1146	3	One particular site, plot no 236 would seem to fit the requirements.
1146	4	I am aware that the adjacent field at the rear of ** and *** ***** of Whitegates Top Pasture Lane could also be utilised alongside this plot which would be ideal for this proposal therefore I would be grateful if you would consider my opinion in your decision.
1147	1	Option A
1147	2	No. At present 68 new houses are being built, which is enough for the village to absorb.
1147	3	How will water supply/drainage cope? How will extra traffic affect our narrow roads?
1147	4	Neither
1147	5	Can we nominate open spaces within the village to be kept that way, even though they are privately owned?
1147	6	Yes
1147	7	Unfortunately I don't know where Gypsy and Traveller sites are, so cannot really give comment.
1147	8	Possibly some together and some separately – would give short term stayers chance to stay near permanent family/friends
1148	1	Yes
1148	2	Option A
1148	3	No. Miller Homes are building a new development. Time must be given to ascertain the impact on the village.
1148	4	None
1148	5	No
1148	6	Yes
1148	7	Existing sites as services – schools are established
1148	8	Residential and transit sites provided together for schools and services
1148	9	None known
1149	1	Yes
1149	2	Option A
1149	3	No. Miller Homes are building a new development. Time must be given to ascertain the impact on the village.
1149	4	None

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1149	5	No
1149	6	Yes
1149	7	Existing sites as services – schools are established
1149	8	Residential and transit sites provided together for schools and services
1149	9	None known
1150	1	Provision should be made to increase the amount of protected open space proportionate to housing an employment development
1150	2	I agree in principle but as regards the number of new houses I have difficulty as the type and density are very relevant and as a layman, I am not qualified without this information to answer. Housing should be proportionate to any employment
1150	3	In my opinion the areas of potential housing in the areas 180, 181, 193, 206, 207, 252, 358 and 359 would create congestion in the common lane area
1150	4	The areas already earmarked are the only logical sites H4 and H6 “employment only”.
1150	5	Improvement to infrastructure should be in place before any development
1150	6	No opinion
1150	7	Existing sites should be developed. Any new development should be well spaced
1150	8	It makes sense to have these together
1150	9	There are no appropriate areas in Harworth
1150	10	Have concerns about the eventual access to the committed housing at the bottom end of Scrooby Road. This is a very busy stretch of road made worse by the permanent parking by residents on the left side. Also don't forget the school
1151	1	I have lived in this house for 79 years (in Harworth for 86 years) when we get heavy rain it always floods the crossroads (mini roundabouts). Also floods my cellar as we are on low ground, everywhere you come to the crossroads to come downhill
1151	2	Please do not allow any development to send surface water to this location, or the flooding will get worse
1151	3	Please do not allow any development on the grass fields around the church (sites 193 and 180).
1151	4	Please do not allow development on old tip site at the corner of Blyth Road and Scrooby Road (site 190).
1151	5	The trees growing on the old tip enhance the appearance of the village
1152	1	If I may, I would like to confirm you a significant plot of land I own in the village of Beckingham and would be grateful if this land could be included in your consultations/deliberations as it has already been earmarked for development within the Bassetlaw development plans. The land in question is situated at 11 Bar Road North, Beckingham and is earmarked on the Bassetlaw plans as H35. For clarification, the rear part of H35 (previously a paddock) has already been developed. I would now like to sell the majority of this, ex- the cottage on site and an currently having plans drawn up to then apply for planning approval.
1153	1	I agree with the SHLAA criteria. but feel Site).Q. has not been thoroughly assessed (see Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
1153	2	Site 30 surrounds Lady Lea Nature Reserve. The reserve is located on a strip of magnesium limestone (very rare), feature impressive limestone outcrops, of significant geological interest.
1153	3	Lady Lea quarry has been the subject of much survey work. It supports 158 species of plant, 58 fungi and 83 types of bird. Kingfishers are regularly seen
1153	4	Development will significantly increase the number of domestic cats threatening this wildlife and this is contrary to the following SHLAA constraints:- 3. Protected Species and Wildlife Sites 8. Ancient Woodland 9. Local Nature Reserves 10. Geodiversity 11. Biodiversity
1153	5	The local area was extensively quarried (see the attached plan). Around 1970, field 286 was the subject of landfill by Sydney Brown Ltd, so the site does not satisfy the SHLAA grounds of:- 15. Ground conditions topology 17. Pollution and contamination 18. Land stability
1153	6	While this does not exclude development of the whole site, the area around the Nature Reserve and adjacent to Lady Lea Farm should be excluded

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1153	7	With regard to Site 9, it is astonishing that no reference is made on figure 4.1 to the Grade I Listed Manor Lodge, built in the 16th Century. This has important links to Hardwick Hall and Bolsover Castle, as they were all designed by the same architect, Robert Smythson and are of significant national importance and would be tainted by development in such close proximity.
1153	8	Site 9 has been highlighted for the potential 250 houses. The A60 is unable to cope with current volume of traffic and we feel that development to the east of Worksop will have a less damaging impact on the infrastructure.
1154	1	I am very concerned about the proposal to build new housing in various parts of the village of North & South Wheatley.
1154	2	am not against small developments as long as they are in keeping with the village and do not have a detrimental effect on existing villagers.
1154	3	Ideally planning should give serious consideration to older people wanting to downsize and younger first time buyers, and preference be given to local residents. New housing should vary in style and have 2 and 3 bedrooms.
1154	4	Consideration should also be given to dog owners and people with children where a garden would be a requirement
1154	5	Off road parking would be an essential requirement
1154	6	I notice that one area for future development is very large and at the end of a road unsuitable for heavy traffic. I hope that if planning is given for this site it does not open the door for it to become an estate of housing in future years
1154	7	I hope that a small development with a maximum of 12 properties over a period of up to 20 years would be the maximum considered, and should definitely be low cost
1154	8	Looking at the plan an ideal site would be for about 2 houses on site number 236 and to take in the paddock at the house to it as Whitegates.
1154	9	Another small development of mixed housing say 3 or 4 on site number 239
1155	1	We do not want any buildings being erected, this area flooded, any extra occupation would make things worse.
1155	2	The drainage cannot cope with extra sewage and rainwater. If you go ahead and grant buildings, what is to stop them flooding? Building them higher? Then wayer does the water go?? Onto the residents down here already. Having had major flooding in the homes (sewage) and everything ruined, would you build my home again higher up so it would not happen
1156	1	Option A
1156	2	Yes.
1156	3	508. Should be Council houses for rent and not sold to tenants at low prices as has happened to most of the original Council houses in the village
1156	4	Outline permission on the two sisters site (adjoining 108 and 145) for 45 houses will add a further 60 to 90 cars on the already congested village roads. Many of which are now dangerously restricted to single carriageway due to roadside parking by residents particularly Farm Lane (at the junction with High Street), Beckland Hill (junction with York Street) and Tuxford Road/Priestgate
1156	5	The village school will be unable to accommodate the influx from the housing developments without considerable expansion
1156	6	Existing sites
1156	7	Together. One assumes that they prefer to be close to their community
1156	8	Yes
1157	1	We do not agree at least 11 new houses should be allocated in Elkesley.
1157	2	33 houses on this site should not be granted, it would affect the surrounding properties, roads, drains etc.
1157	3	We would prefer to the see development on site 246 of the plan- no other properties would be affected and a continuation of Yew Tree Road would complete that area
1158	1	Small development of 2 bedroom cottages for young couples and people wanting to downsize but remain in the village.
1158	2	First refusal to village residents
1158	3	Developments to be in-keeping with the village character where ever possible
1158	4	I am aware of plot no 236 is available and with the adjacent paddock on Top Pasture Lane and would like to support this particular site to this end.
1159	1	While I am in agreement for the development of the proposed plans to give planning consent for the proposed development of 12 houses over the next 17 years, I do not agree to the much bigger development that is proposed. I feel that this would spoil the outlook for this beautiful
1159	2	I would be happy for plot 236 along with the small paddock to be considered as a small development.
1160	1	I am aware that paddock on Top Pasture Lane is to considered for expanding the village. Having spoken to I understand that his neighbour also has a small paddock to the rear of her house which runs along side paddock and would not be oppose to utilising this parcel of land alongside paddock. To this end, I would like to express my wishes for these two paddocks to be considered in your plans for the next foreseeable future for development for North and South Wheatley.
1161	1	No we do no need anymore houses because we cant sell the ones what's up for sale now.
1161	2	No it would not because we need the sewage system up dating to take the houses we've got now
1161	3	We also want resurfacing through out the whole village.
1161	4	Until the bridge is open and up running
1161	5	Until we get what appley in question 62, we might consider more houses in Elkesley until then the system cannot cope with anymore

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1161	6	If Plevins gets the planning permission for their incinerator, we cannot sell the houses now. So what chance have we got if Plevins goes ahead- "NONE".
1162	1	I would like to write to you in support of the above parcel of land belonging to ** * ***** for the proposed sites for potential inclusion of the village envelope. ** * ***** has been a resident of North Wheatley for all of his life until quite recently. I understand from speaking to him that the smaller paddock to the side of his field could be included and to this end I would like to express my support for the two fields which are well maintained currently to be considered by yourselves for residential property purposes.
1163	1	Not until we got drains sorted, the bridge and roads repaired, the drains are always backing up
1163	2	Why build ore houses when we cannot sell the ones that are up for sale.
1163	3	None at the present time
1163	4	If Plevins get their biomass plant we won't be able to sell houses at all, as no will want to live here
1164	1	The school will no longer be large enough to cope with the influx of families and we know from past experience, any promise of a new school will not materialise for many years, if ever, after the houses are built. This will also lead to even more congestion and parking problems for the residents on the surrounding roads, causing danger to adults, children and animals.
1164	2	Traffic flow has increased alarmingly in the years that we have lived here, not only because of the school, but people soon learned they could cut through the estate from Carlton Road and on to the A57 without having to negotiate the traffic lights. However, I fail to understand what time they save as at around 8.30 -9.00 am the queue to get out on to the AS7 regularly tails back to the first roundabout on Ashes Park Avenue.
1164	3	Motorists often travel far to fast (in spite of the 30 mph limit) when they enter Ashes Park Avenue from the AS7, with apparently no awareness that just around the corner, there are 2 turnings immediately to the right and 1 to the left. There is also a dip in the road just past Wellesley Close, whereby when turning right, cars coming towards you cannot be seen until they suddenly appear over the brow of the incline. We had our car written off last year whilst stationary and signalling to turn right into Wellesley Close. Thankfully, the person responsible admitted full liability, but I learned later, this was just one of many accidents/near misses at this junction. Any further increase in traffic flow can only increase the danger.
1164	4	We are aware that you made clear at the recent meeting that Bassetlaw does not have a "green belt". However, the loss of further fields, hedgerows, trees, plants, wildlife habitat etc. can only be detrimental to the area.
1164	5	Gateford Hill House (as it was known) has a long history and lies within a conservation area. Housing being built adjoining its grounds, with the subsequent loss of privacy and views can only be to the detriment of this beautiful now nursing home and its surrounding views
1165	1	In my opinion Worksop does not need t ruin the green lands as they are.
1165	2	What's wrong with looking around the houses around which need renovating and sorting out to be brought back to life
1165	3	The Gateford built estate has ended up a nightmare. More traffic, more jams, schools overflowing. St Johns school were working from a hut due to overflow of pupils from around the area. If more houses are built I any of the 3 areas proposed where are the pupils going? Where s the traffic going? All these things and many more need to be thoroughly thought through first. What about the people already living in these areas? I understand I am not the only person opposing these areas for housing
1165	4	The Kilton Hill and Blyth Road area which I believe will be a blockage when and if the Tesco build goes ahead which I greatly disagree in the first place. The above road and Carlton Road are bust enough as it is, without adding extra agro to the area and people living in the area
1165	5	The ambulances traffic, the hospital, the college, the railway crossing, emergency traffic. What about delivery lorries? And the building works and lorries> Worksop will be grid locked.
1165	6	We do not need Tesco- leave it where it is, they can build up and put if they need to be that greedy. If they are not satisfied with what they've got, they should move out of Worksop altogether. We are not short of good sops to shop in
1165	7	I oppose the areas stated for building land, since we came to live in Worksop (which I then liked) we are completely boxed in on al 4 sides with 'box' houses and pocket sized gardens, we now have no privacy and are overlooked. I oppose the Tesco site. I oppose the building areas. The first consideration which is very much over due is a new covered in and modern bus station.
1166	1	The loss of a large area of prime agricultural land with its associated hedgerows and wildlife habitat.
1166	2	Loss of existing and potential agricultural employment
1166	3	Loss of an area extensively used by multiple groups including dog walkers, walkers, cyclists, horse riders, family groups, bird watchers etc.
1166	4	The crossing of a natural boundary and the subsequent encroachment of Worksop on Carlton in Lindrick.
1166	5	The large increase in the local population and the demand that it would place on already stretched amenities i.e. medical, commercial and social.
1166	6	The increase in the number of cars to the area. exacerbation of the road system which at times struggles to cope with its current use.
1166	7	Concerns over child safety and this increase in traffic volume.
1166	8	The destruction of green areas in order to allow road access to any new development. Even though an assurance to the contrary was given by Richard Schofield at the public meeting on 24th January.
1167	1	We object to your site for future housing development Kilton Golf Course'. We have lived in Larwood for 30 years plus, we were told that if the golf course went under the land would have to be returned to farm land
1167	2	We have had problems in the area with people letting houses and other problems
1167	3	We think they are enough empty houses around Worksop, the Council could refurbish and use

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1167	4	We would miss the woods, walks and the view, the green belt area would go. Nottinghamshire is a beautiful county for the number of walks and scenery. We would become the county of house and no green belt area
1168	1	I agree with the criteria
1168	2	The criteria and how its applied provides a good balanced basis on which to discuss and make decisions to proceed to the next steps. I would make the following observations in relation to the criteria as it applies to Sutton Cum Lound Proposals.
1168	3	Public support was mixed, at the consultation meeting, and constructive feedback was made. The support endorsed links to the village open plan, and included the contribution to the development would make towards sustaining and enabling the expansion of the community facilities and services, which an expanded population will bring about. A larger will help sustain the village hall, pub, church and increase activities, especially for young people. More activities, will bring more people together more often, and will lead to more caring and supportive community.
1168	4	Criteria 2 It will be compatible with existing and proposed uses of the land.
1168	5	The village is largely a residential area for people working in Sheffield, Doncaster and Nottingham, as well as in the smaller towns and industrial parts of Retford and Worksop. This will continue, and more houses and families will help to sustain the village.
1168	6	The Sutton sites will not detract from views through the village, and will create the potential for new walking routes and increased pedestrian movement around the village, which is for community interaction. Walking routes to amenities such as the school, church, shop and village hall could be made possible away from the main roads.
1168	7	Criteria 3: Although the developments are for housing, they will deliver economic development opportunities: mixed housing should include starter homes and possibly sheltered housing, will create child care and care for the elderly, local work opportunities, especially for part time. Housing maintenance, gardening and home help employment will be in demand, creating local employment. Community based voluntary activities will be sustained and grow, and new 'third' sector opportunities will be possible with an increased population, such as first responders working alongside ambulance services.
1168	8	Criteria 4: The main areas for development is not agriculture and is mainly infill between existing development or using land unsuitable for agriculture, this is especially so for numbers 281 and 275
1168	9	Criteria 5 I believe there would be no impact on the water resource
1168	10	Criteria 6: Areas for development will not detract from the land character. The site are mainly away from the main access routes into the village. The developments and access to them will give increased ability to view the character looking toward the village and outward towards the open countryside.
1168	11	Site 281 will complement the existing farmyard conversion, and will not have any negative impact on the character
1168	12	Criteria 7 the development will enhance the built character of the settlement
1168	13	It will particularly benefit the currently unused sites of 281 and 275
1168	14	Criteria 8 it will not detract from the green infrastructure of Sutton Cum Lound. Accessibility to open spaces and footpaths around the village, would be increased if the areas were developed. The new residential areas will not add to congestion or reduce green space.
1168	15	I agree with the overall number of houses for development, but I do not agree that the approach will be to expand by 4 houses per year until 2028. The reasons for this is the phasing of development to 2028 should give consideration to the increased demand for and generating growth of facilities and services, such as schooling, bus service, post office and banking.
1168	16	If the expansion is done through 3 or 4 significant developments to 2028, this will ensure viable development of education and services. For example starter homes for 10 to 15 families will create demand for pre school and school places, of sufficient size to justify and additional class at school, rather than a small growth of four or five into an existing class. These families would make use of the shop, bus and pub to help significant sustain those services. The parents of young families would also provide a number of possible to be employed as carers for elderly people. Expansion of sheltered housing would be very complementary to starter homes, and enable elderly people to down size and stay in the village.
1168	17	The development should be in three significant phases not averaged over the years to 2028 at four per year.
1168	18	Phased development will also enable each development to be planned and designed, including making the best use of environmental technology. For example ground source heating and solar power.
1168	19	Requirements on developers to enhance facilities and provide the necessary mix of housing can be best achieved through larger developments.
1168	20	All sites are appropriate for development in particular 281 which has previously had buildings on it.
1168	21	Site 275 which helps create links between previous housing and the school development.
1168	22	I am a former resident of the village, having been born there and lived in Sutton Cum Lound until the mid 1980. I attended the local school, church and was in the clubs such as the brownies. I believe the p[roposed new housing will bring benefits and a further lease of life to the community.
1168	23	The parish recognises the need for open spaces and references the existing spaces, but there is no references to wanting more. The village is well supported with footpaths which gives easy access to open countryside.
1169	1	Site reference BAS187 would be the better site to use for houses.
1169	2	We and many others wouldn't buy a house on plot 182 as there is a sewage work too close and it does smell.
1169	3	Plots 194 and 192 are too close to a fast road unless speed limits are introduced

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1169	4	Plots 358,359,205, 206 and 207 are far too close to the motorway.
1169	5	H4
1169	6	Employment only
1169	7	All highlighted areas should be protected. Grass/parks areas are essential
1169	8	In order to become a successful town we need other facilities
1169	9	A secondary school large enough to accommodate the growth area
1169	10	Another primary school will also be necessary.
1169	11	A larger leisure centre
1169	12	We are a town yet we still don't have a bank
1169	13	A petrol station
1169	14	All we seem to have is takeaways
1169	15	The area needs to grow significantly before anything like weatherspoons is attempted
1169	16	Maybe a retail park/travel inn
1170	1	Build on brownfield sites instead of greenfield
1170	2	Housing should provide for the elderly – Bungalows, retirement schemes for example M.C. Carthy & Stone in Retford.
1171	1	Concerns -Approach Roads to the Site Traffic from Arlington Way passes -Traffic Lights, St Swathes School, entrances/exits to Business Properties i.e. Chiropractic, Funeral Directors, Bus Depot, Public House, Snooker Hall, Shop, Houses & Flats prior to approaching further traffic lights at the canal bridge on Grove Street where there is a difficult junction with little or no footpath at the entry to Blackstope Lane which gradually narrows to approximately 3.3mtr with open dikes either side.
1171	2	Alternative access is via Grove Lane railway crossing where difficulties could arise at the level crossing and also restricted access.
1171	3	Concerns -The Works Site: The Works Site adjoins a 'Flood Water Catchment Field' as detailed on map dated 29th August 1986.
1171	4	Concerns -Sewage System: The sewage system is still causing problems. Surrounding areas are waterlogged many months of the year. Diluted sewage is often seen after storms and blocked drains are a regular occurrence.
1171	5	Considerations: Development Chief's recommendations to improve the area were not carried out due to Government cutbacks -March 1985. Governments advice on land prone to flooding -July 2007. Bassetlaw Council statement on flood plains -2002. Local Council recommendations -2007. Statement by Insurance Brokers -July 2007.
1172	1	259/R2 RETFORD GOLF CLUB I have no comments to make on this area but I am sure Retford Golf Club will air their views.
1172	2	1/52/40 OFF WEST HILL ROAD All arable fields. On high ground and hence no flooding issues. Easy access off West Hill Road. Very few hedgerows and no wildlife issues. In keeping with recent adjacent housing development.
1172	3	364/41 NR BRECKS ROAD All arable fields. All high ground with no flooding issues. Easy access. Very few hedgerows and no wildlife issues. In keeping with recent adjacent housing development.
1172	4	27 GROVE ROAD/WHITEHOUSES AREA Old nurseries and arable/grass fields. Mostly high ground. Easy access from London Road. Some evergreen bushes around old nursery but minimal impact on wildlife.
1172	5	511 BRACKEN LANE Grass field and low lying. Prone to flooding. Access not too good. Minimal impact on wildlife although the hedgerows are substantial.
1172	6	370/3 LONDON ROAD/GROVE COACH ROAD/CAVENDISH ROAD AREA Grass and arable fields and "Norman's Nurseries". Higher ground than 511 and less likely to flood. Good access from London Road and minimal impact on wildlife.
1172	7	489/488 BRACKEN LANE Mostly rough uncultivated fields. Not low lying and flood risk low. Good hedgerows and reasonable wildlife habitat. One pair of Lapwing bred in 2011. In keeping with housing development in the area.
1172	8	71 WEST CARR ROAD Small area of rough ground and car park for fish and chip shop. Easy access and no wildlife concerns.
1172	9	70 NEAR DARREL ROAD Mostly horse paddocks. Low lying near the river and very prone to flooding. Access not easy but no wildlife concern.
1172	10	10 THRUMPTON LANE Car parks and largely redundant buildings and factories. Easy access and no wildlife issues. Basically a brown field site.
1172	11	51/R7 NORTH ROAD/RANDALL WAY All arable fields. Very easy access off North Road. No flooding issues and totally in keeping with the existing housing and industrial estates in the area. No significant wildlife issues.
1172	12	342 OFF RAGLAN ROAD Currently "Kettlewells" bus park and offices. Easy access off Grove Street and no wildlife issues. Basically a brown field site.
1172	13	69 OFF WELHAM ROAD/SOUTH OF HOP POLE Rough grassland, not currently used for agriculture. Adjacent to the canal, very low lying and extremely prone to flooding. No significant hedges but a strong likelihood of ground nesting birds of conservation concern such as Skylark, Reed Bunting and Meadow Pipit.
1172	14	37/512 NORTH OF BADGER'S CHASE Arable fields on high ground with no flooding risks. Access off Tiln Lane easy but would add to the already congested road and the proximity of Carr Hill School. Some good hedgerows surrounding these fields and five mature oaks. There is likely to be some impact on wildlife particularly breeding birds.
1172	15	533 OFF DURHAM GROVE Small horse paddock. Access difficult. Flooding unlikely. Impact on wildlife minimal.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1172	16	46/309 OFF THE DRIVE PARK LANE Mixture of horse paddocks and some arable fields. Possibility of flooding at the eastern end. Reasonable access off Longholme Road. Impact of wildlife minimal.
1172	17	7 OFF BOTTOM OF PALMER ROAD Some arable fields and grass paddocks but mostly rotational willow coppice. Access not great and possibility of flooding in some parts. Impact on wildlife considerable. Two pairs of Bam Owls (Schedule I protected species) breed close by and hunt over this area, one in my garden and the other pair at an adjacent farm. The willows are a haven for wildlife and provide a good habitat for breeding warblers and for roosting swallows in the autumn. They also provide cover for foxes, hares and Roe Deer all of which are seen regularly. A recent article on pages I and 3 of the Retford Times (Thursday 12th January,2012) explains a little more about the importance of this area.
1173	1	Area 511 is considered to be wholly unsuitable and uneconomic for future development. It is situated at the foot of Grove Hill and the field is purely and simply a flood plain, The history of flooding not only of the field itself but nearby gardens adjacent to the Beck which is round the perimeter of the field is well known and documented. In June 2007 following heavy rain standing water in the field 511 not only totally overwhelmed the Beck which surrounds the field but totally flooded the land occupied by Nos, 9,10,11 12 St Helens Road and also the interior of the bungalow of No 12 St Helens Road, which had to be abandoned by its occupants whilst extensive refurbishment was carried out over several months. Since June 2007 there have been a number of occasions when similar problems have occurred.
1173	2	Not only are there flooding problems there is the important aspect of sewerage capacity covering sewerage collection and disposal. Up to October 2011 when Severn Trent took responsibility for the pipework between 10 St Helens Road and 50 Bracken Lane upwards of 60 residents in St Helens Road, Harcourt Place, Grove Coach Road, Rutland Road, Cavendish Road, Five Fields Road and St Stephens Road were responsible as individual owners for any blockage in that stretch of pipework referred to. The change in responsibility does not alter the responsibility of those residents for maintaining a clear passage not only of sewerage pipes within individual gardens but pipework beyond boundaries until sewerage actually enters the common area referred to and Severn Trent have indicated that the change of responsibility may carry extra financial burden on those residents. The problem of sewerage disposal is well documented and a notice was served by Bassetlaw District Council on all affected residents on the 8th December 2004 for residents to improve drainage flow and which entailed huge expense in the replacement of pitch fibre pipework by modern pipework. Residents are therefore anxious that any development of field 511 will endanger all the improvements made by them should the sewerage disposal be put under strain by the carrying of more effluent than at present.
1173	3	Area 511 is surrounded by narrow roads including one unmade access road, namely Bracken Lane and the east end of Grove Coach Road in coping with existing traffic which is heavy due in part to the proximity of Bracken Lane School. The cost of upgrading roads would not only be considerable but there would be a great increase in traffic congestion and would be a safety hazard to school children and parents at busy times in the school day. Already the traffic entering London Road from both Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Rd is subject to delay, considerable at peak times, and would be exacerbated by any development of the roads surrounding area 511.
1173	4	Area 488 is also considered unsuitable. again due to standing water due to heavy rain and the unsuitability of Bracken Lane to carry increased traffic.
1173	5	Area 489 is considered unsuitable in view of its proximity to Bracken Lane School. There would be considerable safety problems were a development to be agreed so close to a Primary School and schoolchildren would be put at risk.
1173	6	Area 370 adjacent to Cavendish Road suffers from similar problems as area 511 as the field and Beck are prone to similar flooding problems.
1174	1	This proposal is a further significant urbanisation of the Retford area. I will not comment on the consequent need for the provision of utilities and the need for the provision of public facilities. The drainage of surface water and the outlook from local treatment plants may be significantly affected by urbanisation and other developments upstream and downstream. Adequate communications need to be in place to minimise problems
1174	2	In the PHSR (potential housing site references) there will be many trees and hedgerows. These are likely to have a significant role locally in the conversion of carbon dioxide into oxygen. In an endeavour to ensure a continuous conversion sequence, tree etc. planting needs to be done well before tree removal. I am not an arborist an so am unable to suggest a timetable or the most suitable types of tree(s)
1174	3	PHSR 511 and 379 and the eastern potion of PHSR 3 are potential areas of flooding and should not be used. Only if the necessary technical action of raising the floods and roadways approximately 1 metre from the present level is applied
1174	4	Some areas can significantly increase the rapid run off. This drains beneath the route way in the region adjacent to PHSR 1/29
1174	5	The problematic exits from the Grove Coach and Bracken Lane area and onto London Road. At present there is other congestion and more houses are likely to exacerbate the problem.
1174	6	There ought to be a requirement to attenuate the noise from road and railway traffic. Those who live nearby require our support in this weather.
1175	1	I wish to comment on the possible selection of the above site for new housing (site 7). Agricultural value. During the past 35 years most of this land has been used for food production- grass reared bullocks and later arable crops- wheat, linseed beans rape. Previous to this part of the land was an orchard- historical maps. Part of the western half of the land was under drained 5-20 years ago. The present use for willow biomass may not indicate the land agricultural potential. Soil scientists and hydrologists from ADAS visited the site weekly when the willow was first planted, all stated it was good wheat growing land
1175	1	As you have read, my comments are more questions than solutions. I hope that you will consult with the DEFRA regarding the agricultural value of the land and the removal of the willow coppice, with the Forestry Commission and Natural England regarding the removal of the willow coppice, with the Environment Agency and the Ryton and Idle Drainage Board regarding surface drainage, watercourses on and near the site, and flood risk and with Severn Trent regarding the surface water drainage, sewers and flood risk.
1175	2	Removal of willow coppice. With the willow, after ten years growth prove an impediment to housing development, particularly as part of the land was under drained relatively recently (see above)? Will it be necessary first to remove the willow and then to grow arable crops (say wheat) for several years before and houses are built.

Reference number		Answer
Response number	Comment	
1175	3	Public access. Two north-south public footpaths cross the land. Also, there has been public access for walking to the western most field for perhaps 15-20 years. When arable crops were grown, this public access was to be a grassed area in this field's north-west corner. Since the willow was planted, members of the public have each day walked around the four sides of the fields, using the headlands. Has public access other than the public footpaths been merely tolerated by the landowners, or encouraged by an access agreement of some sort?
1175	4	Wildlife. I have recently observed bats (pipistrelle), pheasants, partridges, montjac deer, roe deer, sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards frequenting the land. In the more remote past I have also seen hares crossing the site
1175	5	Hedgerows and trees. Are any of the hedgerows and/or trees worthy of preservation. The trees near the farmhouse and the tall hedgerows on the eastern half of the site seem possible candidates.
1175	6	Surface drainage and flood risk. My sketch map (see original submission) shows the steep slopes and the stream on the western half of the land and the steep slope at the northern end of Bigsby Road. When the Shetlands (a road off Tiln Lane) was developed several years ago, the stream flowed vigorously for many weeks. It flows similarly during heavy rain. I believe that at least some of the surface and land drains (possibly spring-fed) from adjacent existing housing area (and possibly from as far away as Tiln Lane) flows into this stream. Filling in the stream could therefore result in a flood risk on site 7 and perhaps an adjacent low lying farmland. The flood risk on site 7 could be further increased by run-off from the steeply sloping northern end of Bigsby Road, which becomes a stream during heavy rain
1175	7	Housing density. 716 houses as proposed on site 7 (perhaps 60 acres) is a remarkably low density. A developer would surely demand at least that number if not many more on the western half of the site alone. If the entire site is developed, and 1200, 1800 or even more houses are built (densities of 20, 30 or more/acre) will the local roads and infrastructure be able to cope, and does Retford have a need or a market for so many houses in the next four years?
1175	8	Topography. A housing development restricted to the western half of the site would be surrounded on 3 sides by farmland and project 400 meters beyond the town boundary. Is that desirable? Development of the whole site would mean that houses in the north-eastern corner of the site would be 700 meters from the exiting town boundary and indeed in Clarborough Parish. Again, is this desirable?
1175	9	Roads. If the western half of the site is developed, the distance along existing public side streets (Bigsby Road or Palmer Road) between the northern edge of the development and the nearest through road (Tiln Lane) will be about 1000 meters. If the whole site is developed, the same distance may be 1500 meters. Surely, shorter access roads from the site to Welham Road or Smeath Road should be constructed
1175	10	If the access is via Bigsby Road, please note that the slope at the northern end of that road has recently meant that the road was dangerous or impassable in snowy weather for days on end
1175	11	Sewers given the sloping nature of the site, if sewerage from the new houses was routed to the existing housing development, almost all the site would need pumped sewage systems. Could residual willow roots (particularly given the under drainage work) damage any new sewers on the site. Again, surely new sewers should be constructed from the site towards the nearest main sewers (say Welham Road) so sewage could exit the site by gravity
1175	12	Moorgate farm. Development on site 7 could be restricted to the extreme south-western corner where the land is relatively level and problems with loss of agricultural land, public access, wildlife, hedgerow and trees would be minimal, and there should be no road access, surface drainage and sewerage problems. However, houses in this part of site 7 would be only 200 meters from Moorgate Farm, and next to the land of Moorgate Farm, both of which I understand the Council wants to conserve.
1176	1	Agricultural value. During the past 35 years most of this land has been used for food production (cattle rearing and later arable crops, namely wheat, beans etc.). Part of the western half of the land was under drained perhaps 15-20 years ago. The present use for willow coppicing may not indicate the land's agricultural potential
1176	2	Removal of willow coppice. With the willow, after ten years growth prove an impediment to housing development, particularly as part of the land was under drained relatively recently (see above)? Will it be necessary first to remove the willow and then to grow arable crops (say wheat) for several years before houses are built
1176	3	Public access. Two north-south public footpaths cross the land. Also, there has been public access for walking to the western most field for perhaps 15-20 years. When arable crops were grown, this public access was to be a grassed area in this field's north-west corner. Since the willow was planted, members of the public have each day walked around the four sides of the fields, using the headlands. Has public access other than the public footpaths been merely tolerated by the landowners, or encouraged by an access agreement of some sort?
1176	4	Wildlife. I have recently observed bats (pipistrelle), pheasants, partridges, montjac deer, roe deer, sparrow hawks, owls and buzzards frequenting the land. In the more remote past I have also seen hares crossing the site
1176	5	Hedgerows and trees. Are any of the hedgerows and/or trees worthy of preservation. The trees near the farmhouse and the tall hedgerows on the eastern half of the site seem possible candidates
1176	6	Surface drainage and flood risk. My sketch map (see original submission) shows the steep slopes and the stream on the western half of the land and the steep slope at the northern end of Bigsby Road. When the Shetlands (a road off Tiln Lane) was developed several years ago, the stream flowed vigorously for many weeks. It flows similarly during heavy rain. I believe that at least some of the surface and land drains (possibly spring-fed) from adjacent existing housing area (and possibly from as far away as Tiln Lane) flows into this stream. Filling in the stream could therefore result in a flood risk on site 7 and perhaps an adjacent low lying farmland. The flood risk on site 7 could be further increased by run-off from the steeply sloping northern end of Bigsby Road, which becomes a stream during heavy rain.
1176	7	Housing density. 716 houses as proposed on site 7 (perhaps 60 acres) is a remarkably low density. A developer would surely demand at least that number if not many more on the western half of the site alone. If the entire site is developed, and 1200, 1800 or even more houses are built (densities of 20, 30 or more/acre) will the local roads and infrastructure be able to cope, and does Retford have a need or a market for so many houses in the next four years?

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1176	8	Topography. A housing development restricted to the western half of the site would be surrounded on 3 sides by farmland and project 400 meters beyond the town boundary. Is that desirable? Development of the whole site would mean that houses in the north-eastern corner of the site would be 700 meters from the exiting town boundary and indeed in Clarborough Parish. Again, is this desirable? Roads. If the western half of the site is developed, the distance along existing public side streets (Bigsby Road or Palmer Road) between the northern edge of the development and the nearest through road (Tiln Lane) will be about 1000 meters . If the whole site is developed, the same distance may be 1500 meters. Surely, shorter access roads fro the site to Welham Road or Smeath Road should be constructed
1176	9	If the access is via Bigsby Road, please note that the slope at the northern end of that road has recently meant that the road was dangerous or impassable in snowy weather for days on end
1176	10	Sewers given the sloping nature of the site, if sewerage from the new houses was routed to the existing housing development, almost all the site would need pumped sewage systems. Could residual willow roots (particularly given the under drainage work) damage any new sewers on the side. Again, surely new sewers should be constructed from the side towards the nearest main sewers (say Welham Road) so sewage could exit the site by gravity
1176	11	Moorgate farm. Development on site 7 could be restricted to the extreme south-western corner where the land is relatively level and problems with loss of agricultural land, public access, wildlife, hedgerow and trees would be minimal, and there should be no road access, surface drainage and sewerage problems. However, houses in this part of site 7 would be only 200 meters from Moorgate Farm, and next to the land of Moorgate Farm, both of which I understand the Council wants to conserve.
1176	12	As you have read, my comments are more questions than solutions. I hope that you will consult with the DEFRA regarding the agricultural value of the land and the removal of the willow coppice, with the Forestry Commission and Natural England regarding the removal of the willow coppice, with the Environment Agency and the Ryton and Idle Drainage Board regarding surface drainage, watercourses on and near the site, and flood risk and with Severn Trent regarding the surface water drainage, sewers and flood risk.
1177	1	We, the undersigned are objecting to the inclusion of the following areas of land identified as potential sites for future development: Area 511 is a flood plain and as it stands at the foot of Grove Hill absorbs all the water from the higher level. The Beck which runs around the perimeter of 511 is then overwhelmed by the water from 511 with consequential flooding of our garden, that of our near neighbours at number 11, 12 and 10 St Sellers Road. Number 12 has been badly affected in recent years with water penetrating the unsure of the bungalows leading to evacuation of elderly residents whilst refurbishment was carried out.
1177	2	In addition, the main sewerage pipe into which our sewerage is emptied is under pressure and the sewerage system is already at capacity. Any future development would overwhelm the system.
1177	3	Also the narrow roads above area 511 are entirely unsuitable for additive traffic which any development would create.
1177	4	The field is presently used for dairy farming and at a time when government is urging us to be more self sufficient in food production. Such a development would run counter to that.
1177	5	The area 488- again is unsuitable for similar reasons or gives in our earlier comments on area 511.
1177	6	The area 489- this field is in close proximity to Bracken Lane primary school and any development would be an opinion create considerable safety problems for younger school children.
1178	1	Retford has adequate housing at the moment and all efforts should be spent on encouraging businesses into other sites within the town to create jobs for the area.
1178	2	The site gets waterlogged during wet spells and is therefore unsuitable for such development.
1178	3	Any entrance to the site would be extremely dangerous given the speed at which traffic travels on the Leverton Road and the blind approach to any such entrance due to the canal and railway bridges.
1178	4	The Site is home to a wide variety of wild birds and wild animals and the loss of this habitat would endanger their survival in the area.
1178	5	In the writer's previous dealings with the Planning Department he was advised that on leaving Retford on either the Leverton Road or the Welham Road the canal was the boundary for any further housing developments, since when was that ruling changed?
1178	6	It would detract from the views of the open countryside enjoyed by walkers like my wife and myself when walking the canal path.
1178	7	Surely the large numbers of "For Sale" signs that adorn most, if not all, of the current housing developments in Retford give a strong indication that further housing development must come second to any form of development that will bring employment to the town.
1179	1	The questionnaire for this consultation was completed in this village in 2012 or before that: people supported the idea on new properties and there were some who wish to see affordable properties.
1179	2	Properties started since the questionnaire in Everton should be seen as part of the 13 in question 66. However, I feel that a small number of affordable properties is desirable if the funding becomes available.
1179	3	Currently you have given permission for 12 houses on the west of High Street at its southern end. This will make a big increase in housing density which I consider may alter the conservation area.
1179	4	The open space (ex paddock) at corner should be kept to counteract this.
1179	5	The increase in traffic flows near the A631 should also be considered. It is a safety issue do we need a one way system?

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1179	6	I hate to suggest you use farmland but there may be no option. If this is your decision it should be only small areas of 345 and 409
1179	7	the last 40 years Everton has expanded quite fast but it is still a small village. You see it as a Service Centre. Residents complain of poor bus services. Car ownership is a necessity. There are no shops or medical facilities. However, we have a church, school, two pubs, a village hall, sports facilities, children's play area and hairdressers. All of these are well used by non villagers.
1179	8	It's a compact conservation village mostly to the north of the A631. There are open spaces - the playing field, the churchyard with its Blue Butterfly project and corner farm paddock still with a hedge. The village envelope has served us well but most infill sites have been built on. Many smaller properties have been extended or replaced. We lack smaller properties suitable for new buyers or down sizes. Few work in the village but mobile reception is poor and so is broadband so it is not ideal for business purposes.
1179	9	Village roads are a problem. There are huge farm vehicles. Some parts of the village lack footways. The junctions off the A631 are tight and often partially blocked by parked vehicles whose owners are making good use of our facilities. These generate traffic problems and any new roads leading into the village between High Street and chapel Lane could only increase the problem especially as viability towards Bawtry is difficult and the Sun Inn junction difficult if cars are parked in front of the pub. Mattersey Road also presents problems for big vehicles passing each other as it is narrow.
1179	10	farming is part of the village heritage. I believe the farm buildings and other features should be preserved. I might argue with you about your choice of properties to be locally listed but was glad that Northfield Farmstead was finally developed. We are surrounded by farmland I believe this should be kept if possible as in the future we may become more dependent on home grown food. There is plenty of brownfield land in Bassetlaw so lets build on this first.
1180	1	We need to be building small homes, what i call 'starter and finishing' homes. That is small homes, detached, semi-detached, linked or whatever appropriate design for the location, that a young person can 'start with' or indeed an older person can 'finish with'. These units are really the 'same thing'; they are compact in design, probably two bedroom unit that is easy to look after.
1180	2	In a similar way, I am very concerned about such as huge number of 'traveller sites' proposed across such a small District. I really don't see why so many sites should be necessary and become the burden on the Council and rate payers especially when things go wrong. We can create these but not the homes I'm suggesting! Why?
1181	1	Un till the existing proposals on the colliery site are up and running it is difficult to imagine what else will be required.
1181	2	plots 184, 185, 188, 190, 193 or 182 These plots are more central
1181	3	H4
1181	4	The town need more facilities a bank
1181	5	A petrol station
1181	6	Investment in the schools
1181	7	play areas in Harworth and old Harworth
1181	8	Yes, through there should be more protected areas
1181	9	A
1181	10	I think they should be in existing sites as this creates a better community setting. Any new sites create fragmentation within the traveller community.
1181	11	Together, for same reason
1182	1	In Shireoaks there is currently no GP and I travel to Woodsetts. A GP would need to be provided if more housing in village.
1182	2	I would be very concerned if more housing and employment land were made available in Shireoaks as the A57 is already much over capacity and it can often take 20 minutes to get to the M1.
1182	3	We moved to Shireoaks as it is a lovely family with an already busy school.
1182	4	The only thing lacking in the area is a public house so would be very happy to see the marina developed further.
1183	1	I have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsal! for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41 , 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near the bridge. The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This Village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1183	2	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road I Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times.
1183	3	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1183	4	Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1183	5	The proposed Sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife –including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed. feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees.+ wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1183	6	The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathletes etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1183	7	For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1184	1	I have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near the bridge. The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This Village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1184	2	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road / Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times.
1184	3	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1184	4	Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1184	5	The proposed Sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife –including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed. feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees.+ wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1184	6	The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathletes etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1184	7	For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1185	1	As stated at the meeting in Retford Town Hall on Monday 23 January, Blackstope Lane has flood problems and unlikely to be built on, but after having heavy rain the bottom of Bracken Lane is flooded as are the fields (ref 3, 370,511) and the bottom of our garden which looks onto these sites. The water hasn't any where to go as it comes down from the Grove area. Also the school field is water logged for many months of the year.
1185	2	The traffic problem both with Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane, as these are the only two exit roads onto London Road. At school times these roads are both extremely busy and it's no small miracle that no one has been knocked over or even killed. The school itself is on Bracken Lane and there is often a police presence to keep the traffic flowing, Parents taking children to school park on Rose Avenue, Bramble Road and of course Bracken Lane itself, I just hope that the three aforementioned roads never need any of the emergency services between 8.30-9.30am, 11.30am-1.30pm and 3.15 -4.15pm because they wouldn't be able to access these road. I suggest you send a survey team to get some idea of how fraught it is, and more houses mean more cars, at least one per household. Also Grove Coach road is a nightmare to exit, and Bracken Lane -manic!
1185	3	As stated we live next to the farm facing plot, 511 and 370, recently the lane at the bottom of our garden has been declared a Public Footpath and over the last few months we have noticed an increase in cars and vans using this lane as an alternative route, bypassing the school area. Its a lane not a road. This lane is very popular with dog walkers and families walking in general, the increase in traffic has at times become dangerous, additional housing will only add to this.
1185	4	We understand planning has already been granted for six new houses to be built on Bracken Lane, this will increase the traffic flow and the intake to the school which is full to bursting.
1186	1	Focused on Harworth Bircotes
1186	2	Yes if the adopted Core Strategy can significantly restrict the development of infill properties on domestic garden land. It would be better to develop a small group of properties with good open space in a planned location than to continue to suffer the loss of existing gardens and open spaces that were once common and that are part of the character of the village.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1186	3	However, if the District Council is not able to significantly restrict the development of infill properties on domestic garden land, then land should not be allocated since the number of successful infill dwelling applications is likely to be greater than 11
1186	4	Development of part of site 508 would be acceptable subject a significant part of the site being released as open space. This site is currently protected open space without public access.
1186	5	Development of part of the site 142 and or part of site 152 would be acceptable subject to good open space provision, good pedestrian/ cycle access, and adequate off street parking. Development of the whole of these sites would not be acceptable
1186	6	I am strongly opposed to development of site 522, 523, 524, 486, 491 and 526 because of the adverse impact upon the Conservation Area and or important views described in the Village Design Statements.
1186	7	Sites 108, 112, 150 and 503 have problems related to vehicle access
1186	8	Sites 143, 150 and 503 would allow development close to A57.
1186	9	I do not think that the village should extend to the edge of the A57 bypass.
1186	10	In the period since this consultation process started the village store and the butcher shop have closed. This raises the question about the status of the village as a Rural Service Centre.
1186	11	Site 145 and 146 on the village plan already have full planning permission. There is outline planning permission for more than 40 houses on the former poultry factory site subject to legal agreement. In total, approximately 65 houses are already approved in some form and are likely to be built in the coming years. Any site allocation would be additional to this.
1186	12	Yes, the open spaces on the map should be protected from future development.
1186	13	Other open spaces to be considered for protection from development land surrounding Pond Corner (near Pond Farm) including the garden at Old Wells Cottage, The Heritage Orchard (east of Top Cart Gaps and south of the A57), fields to the east and west of Great Lane south of High Street, fields between Low Street, Mark Lane and the former poultry factory site, Land south of the village school and north of the high street (the extension to the school field and the former recreation ground south of this
1187	1	I wish to register my objections, in the strongest possible terms, to the proposal to develop area 35 for the following reasons. This would be a major development, adjoining other recent, and very substantial developments. This is obviously NOT a site if proposed "in-fill" development and neither would it be a small "add-on" development.
1187	2	This proposal envisages appropriate multi green field, prime agricultural land within an area of developments which were themselves only completed within the last decade or so. The loss of such farming and amenity land would have obvious detrimental consequences for the existing community. The loss of this extremely large area of prime agricultural and amenity land MUST be of concern, as must the associated loss of existing and potential agricultural employment in the area. The expanse of such a large area of cultivated greenfield land which comprises area 35 is, beyond argument, of prime importance to the existing community of Gateford, and indeed, beyond.
1187	3	Apart from its importance to food production, it is also a major leisure facility and is very extensively used by dog walkers family walkers, joggers, cyclists, equestrians, Nordic walkers, bird watchers, wildlife enthusiasts etc.
1187	4	Once granted, permission to develop this extensive parcel of land, would deprive the existing community of Gateford, and beyond, of this greenfield amenity land and would have a detrimental effect on adjoining ancient woodland, established hedgerows, bird and wildlife and leisure opportunities, for all ages, and particularly families. Once developed, this amenity and agricultural land would, of course, be lost forever, and future generations deprived of the undoubted benefit of this land, in its agricultural state, affords.
1187	5	The existing Gateford developments are matched by the amenities which are available. Any further development within this area would therefore stretch the available resources considerably.
1187	6	There is also a natural boundary formed by the existing Gateford developments, and any crossing of this established line, for development purposes, would be to encroach upon Carlton in Lindrick and Carlton church is even visible from across the proposed area 35 fields. This proposed development erodes Carlton's identity as a village, with Worksop's sprawl in this direction resulting in real fears of a Worksop/Carlton conurbation. For instance, at the presentation of the Core Plan, on 25th January at Worksop Town Hall, Richard Schofield told those assembled that there would be no allocation of land at Carlton within the Core Plan and the reason he gave for this was the high level of planning applications currently pending within Carlton. To cross the existing boundary would, it is suggested, encroach into this level of development into and around the Carlton-in-Lindrick area.
1187	7	The proposed developer, in their extensive published literature, informs us that 700-800 houses are planned for area 35. At the MOST CONSERVATIVE estimate this would mean, at the VERY least, an extra 1,500 people together with at the VERY least 1,000 extra cars to cater for within an area of quite recent development anyway, where amenities have hardly kept pace with the existing needs and requirements
1187	8	For instance, medical facilities for Gateford residents involves travel, usually private cars, to the area around Bassetlaw hospital to the east, or to the South of the centre of Worksop. The addition is at least another 1,000 private cars in the Gateford area, just in search of doctors, dentists and opticians would potentially exacerbate the present traffic, access and pollution problems, as well as stretching existing amenities even further.
1187	9	Likewise, the railway facilities at Worksop and Shireoaks are located at driving distance from Gateford.
1187	10	The nearest shops for area 35 would be even further distanced from the existing Gateford developments, so that almost all journeys from area 35 to the local shops could be expected to be made by private cars.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1187	11	The need for these facilities is demonstrated by the amount of cars which regularly enter and exit the car park there at various times of the day. Another 700-800 families on area 35 would put an unimaginable strain on these shopping facilities and the car park. And, it has to be remembered, that there is ONLY one vehicular entrance and exit to the shops, involving the already busy Raymoth Lane, and the Gateford Road/Raymoth Lane junction. Many of these extra journeys by private car if area 35 were developed would, of course, be through other built-up areas of the locality.
1187	12	One very interesting fact that surfaced with contact with other Gateford residents during the extremely limited time that this Core Plan has become public knowledge, is just how many existing Gateford residents travel to work outside of the Worksop area, mostly to the Sheffield area, but some also to Rotherham. This would also seem to be reflected in shopping habits and patterns in that large numbers of Gateford residents say that they meet much of this shopping requirement in Sheffield, Meadowhall and Rotherham/Parkgate areas. This trend could be expected to be repeated in any NEW Gateford development, designed to double the size of Gateford as we now know it. And if Gateford is to become a large dormitory area for Sheffield, with the interests of residents away from this area then this, demonstrably, does very little in the way of rejuvenating the town centre of Worksop.
1187	13	At the public meeting, residents were assured by Richard Schofield that those areas which are marked green on the Core Plan were to be kept as such in their entirety. However, if a new access road is to be built from the roundabout at Ashes Park Avenue/Edison Avenue, then this is clearly NOT going to be true because such an access road would inevitably cut through a sizeable portion of this green area which, we were assured, was sacrosanct.
1187	14	Along with this new access, which would inevitably be required for the 700-800 new houses and ancillary building on area 35, there would be obvious additions to the existing traffic dangers in such an overall, gigantic Gateford. For not only would the increase in private cars, delivery vehicles, utility and services vehicles be added to by emergency vehicles, but the new development would presumably require a bus route as well for the new, sprawling Gateford estate, which as envisaged, would develop all of the land right up to Owday Woods.
1187	15	These increased dangers would, quite naturally, threaten the very young and the very old most. This would be true, of course, for the huge amount of construction traffic which would be required to develop area 35, over the existing, restrictive roads, should the proposed development be permitted it must also be remembered that the proposed construction traffic, building materials and heavy plant and equipment deliveries etc. would have to access the area 35 site by one of only two access from Ashes Park Avenue, through existing developments, and also by one of only TWO entry and exit accesses on Gateford itself i.e. Ashes Park Avenue and Eddison Avenue.
1187	16	There has already, we were informed at the 24th January meeting, already been considerable consultation on their plan, stretching back some years. Despite assurances at this week's presentation though the general feeling was that the Local Authority had NOT been seen to besting itself in respect of public awareness of the plan. Indeed, those interested members of the public had known about the plan for considerably less than a month, some for only a matter of days. It was only via the efforts of individual Gateford residents, and a limited leaflet drop via one local council member, that details of the plan became generally known.
1187	17	It is also obvious that the proposed developers of area 35, Lands Improvements Holdings Plc., have been privy to information for a lot longer than Gateford residents have. Time enough, for instance, for them to produce a very large, colour prospectus for the development of area 35, and obviously at some cost. This apparently seeks to convince its reader that this commercial organisation have nothing but conservation in mind, and indeed, that they are able to improve upon nature, and that this site (or perhaps sight?) will be all the better, both socially and aesthetically, than creation ever intended. This is patently nonsense of course. It is known, for instance, that they have also commissioned an ornithological survey, which is being carried out this week. Individual Gateford residents, of course, who have only learnt of these monstrous development plans for a few weeks, and with a hurried timetable deadline fast approaching, can have no such recourse to such resources.
1187	18	All of the cogent argument appears stacked against the development of area 35. Indeed, it has been suggested that the major reason for the inclusion of such an obviously unsuitable parcel of land for proposed development within the Core Plan was primarily that there was a developer eager, indeed forcibly pushing for this land to be included within the Core Plan. So in this light, it would appear to be the wishes of a commercial organisation, landowners/developers, set against the overwhelming wishes of local residents, common sense and decency. It is transparently clear that the developer plans for these productive fields and social amenities are driven by the prospect of huge profits rather than their philanthropic or altruistic considerations. Local residents, on the other hand, are concerned about this environment, conservation, local amenities standard of life for their families and safety issues. It could be argued that the letting area 35 be developed would be betrayal of the existing residents of Gateford, and beyond, and could well be seen as environmental vandalism by the Local Authority.
1187	19	Once this productive agricultural land has been developed it will, of course, be lost as such forever, along with the food and employment that it supplies. The leisure facilities will be lost to posterity. The level of wildlife and birdlike habitat that it affords will likewise never return. The extra strain on a comparatively recently adopted area would be enormous, where the amenities have hardly kept pace anyway. The massive increase in population, and the servicing of that population, together with the massive increase in individual journeys on already restricted roads on and off of the existing development would lower the safety level and social standards enormously. The cross-boundary development towards Carlton-in-Lindrick would adversely affect Worksop, the area of Gateford and Carlton-in-Lindrick itself.
1188	1	Having only recently moved into our home, 3 Wentworth Close, Ordsall, Retford DN22 7NG, both my wife and I are annoyed to hear of land that may be allocated to housing very near to us. We purchased this house some five years ago and have been renting it out in that time. We moved in ourselves just before Christmas, and are very impressed with the location. We chose this area because of its proximity to both the golf course and open countryside, both of which are at the moment a couple of minutes walk from home. We have always liked to walk, and the various footpaths in the area are perfect for a leisurely stroll. The thought of yet more housing on rural land adjacent to our estate is not very pleasing, as it will make it harder for us to reach open countryside. This may sound selfish, but we also consider the fact that more housing needs more jobs to pay for them, and we feel that there is insufficient demand for housing at this particular time. For these reasons I would like to tender our objection to the proposed housing allocation to land sites reference 41, 364 and 259.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1189	1	Site 370 behind Cavendish road in Retford is a flood plain and has on several times over the past few years resembled a lake (see photo), between this natural SUDS barrier and the houses on Cavendish road is a 7 foot deep culvert that belongs to the residents, this culvert on many occasions has been running full to the top and only because of the natural flood plane our houses have not flooded.
1189	2	Further down the road where Cavendish road meets Grove Coach road the houses were not so lucky and suffered serious flood damage, the existing drainage system in the area struggles to cope at the best of times and would not cope with any increased flow as the water runs downs the adjacent high plane fields. If this proposed development gets the green light and this natural defence is replaced and paved over who would be held responsible for any flood damage to our properties, The council? The builders? The former land owners? I would be looking to seek damages from all three parties as they should all be held responsible for their actions or their omissions of a duty of care.
1189	3	SUDS has been mentioned as a solution and could be used, but the land would need serious inspection as all the water from the ridge behind the planned development runs through these areas. This area has its own natural SUDS drainage so how and why would anyone try to improve on it? Turning the field into a lake would be like SUDS but then where do they build the houses?
1189	4	My comment is about site 370 but site 511 and the bottom section of site 3 must also be taken into consideration.
1189	5	On a different note all 3 of these sites are a natural and long standing habitat for a multitude of wild life including - Tawny owls, a Barn owl reside in a tree 2 doors down from our property, frogs, toads and newts make great use of the culvert, a Woodpecker often frequents the tree in our garden along with Squirrels, Ducks and Herons etc.
1189	6	The Primary School located on Bracken Lane is running at full capacity and an increase in the catchment area would seriously overload the system and also the nearest secondary School is over 2 miles away
1189	7	On a final note, when we have paved over paradise where will all these extra children play? where will all these extra people enjoy the natural environment and wildlife, walk their dogs? Does anyone really care as long as targets are achieved and money is made.
1190	1	Council agreed to take guidance from the Village Design Statement (VDS) and the survey of residents carried out by Bassetlaw DC and summarised in the Issues and Options Consultation paper (SAIOP). The VDS in the Building Integration and Relationship Guidelines (section H) states: - "It is unlikely that individual developments greater than two or three dwellings could be absorbed into the village design and landscape". Later in Section I – The Future, The VDS states that "Wheatley will – it is hoped – continue to be a living and developing village"
1190	2	Council firstly discussed housing need and agreed that the village is lacking accommodation for elderly residents who wish to down-size but stay in the village. There is also a need for a small number of houses suitable for first time buyers. Ideally any new properties should therefore be 2-bedroomed starter and retirement homes, with a preference for bungalows.
1190	3	Council agreed with residents in that the village does not need any large 4/5 bed executive type homes and certainly no large developments of properties or estates.
1190	4	Bearing in mind all of the issues, Council agreed (on a majority vote) that a maximum of 6 new properties could be built over and above the natural 'windfall'. Council again agreed with residents that the narrow roads and infrastructure could not cope with more than a small number of new properties.
1190	5	Council discussed all the sites identified as "Potential Housing" in the SAIOP and agreed that only sites with good road frontage options should be considered. It was felt that a small part (North West corner) of Site No 239 on the plan with 2 separate access points and frontages onto Low Street and Retford Road would suit.
1190	6	The remainder of site No. 239 and the other sites identified on the plan were deemed by Council to be unsuitable for development.
1191	1	I think that before a decision can be made about Gypsy and Traveller site location in the District more consultation with members of the Travelling community living in the District on existing sites and also those in housing needs to take place. There should also be some consultation with members of the settled community living in and around existing sites.
1191	2	New sites should not necessarily be concentrated in and around existing sites but should be considered in new locations around the District in order to give members of the Travelling community a choice in line with that given to the wider settled community.
1191	3	Following discussions I have had with members of the Travelling community a local authority /housing association run site would be more preferable to a private owned and run site as it would give affordable housing choices similar to general needs housing tenants.
1191	4	"Views are mixed on the extent to which transit pitches can be successfully provided on permanent sites" the Good Practice guide advises and goes onto say that where the mix has been successful and both types of provision are available on one site the transit pitches are usually adjacent to the main residential site or at one end of it. Transit sites may present particular management challenges and dependant upon usage there may need to be a resident manager living on a semi-permanent basis on the site.
1191	5	I am not aware of any land that could be considered suitable for Gypsy and Traveller site provision but it may be worth asking this question of existing site owners as they may also own other land or have contact with other land owners.
1192	1	It was resolved that the Council's response to NCC be that whereas there was scope for up to 10 dwellings within the parish envelope, all the sites identified had development problems particularly with regard to access.
1193	1	We suggest that 'Option 3' should be most suitable site for future employment and housing development.
1193	2	The existing Football pitch could be moved to the rear of the development.
1193	3	Emphasis must be placed upon creating employment rather than building too many new houses. Hence allocating suitable land with facilities is important to attract investor.
1193	4	There should be provisions for building schools, Doctor's surgery and shops.
1193	5	Land should be allocated to build Community centre, especially for old people, Children's play area, Internet cafe and youth centre.
1193	6	Traffic congestion and pollution problems must be kept to a minimum.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1194	1	I wish to make comment regarding the above site. I live next to this site and feel that if allowed to be developed this would impact on the wildlife of the area. We have regularly seen Roe Deer, Muntjac and Hares as well as the more common Rabbits, Pheasants and Partridge. We also have a Barn Owl and Sparrow Hawk regularly use this field for hunting, if developed this would move the wildlife further away from Retford when we should surely be trying to maintain a balance with nature.
1194	2	One of my biggest fears for this proposed development on the NE of Retford is the impact of vehicles onto an already dangerous road, Tiln lane, at school opening and closing time. Tiln lane becomes totally blocked at these times with parked cars, large lorries and everyday traffic all trying to get through - more houses would surely create more traffic problems.
1194	3	I believe Retford should be trying to bring in more business with housing located near, this should stop Retford becoming just a commuter town where people leave in a morning to work elsewhere and returning at night. We need people to work in Retford to use the shops and facilities in the town to keep Retford alive. We also need to keep car journeys to a minimum.
1194	4	Finally the more we allow the boundary of Retford to expand the more likely we are to see Clarborough Village become a suburb of Retford.
1195	1	The Ashtons at Reyton Farm would be caught in a pocket between sites, severely curtailing their ability for rotation and 'set-aside'. The Baddeleys at Carlton forest Farm on the other side of the proposed development, have a large dairy herd as well as arable and currently graze the cattle on much of the proposed development site
1195	2	Security on the Estate is a major issue at present. In the last two years alone 3 land rovers, 2 quad bikes have been taken; straw supplies set on fire; the wood yard and maintenance yard broken into with machinery and tools being stolen; lead thefts from the Church and one of the cottages; diesel thefts and a thwarted attempt to rustle sheep last autumn to name a few and the Insurance continues to rocket
1195	3	The farmers already have problems with people walking dogs through the crops, (I've caught several myself,) not keeping to 'rights of way" clearly indicated on signposts. We frequently find remains of fires in the woods and strewn cans and bottles -the remains of parties presumably and arson of a hedgerow last autumn. Poaching is a problem for any estate but the littering and dumping of rubbish, some of which could endanger wildlife is an issue and has to be removed by somebody. All this is a continual problem and very expensive to rectify the damage, to police and to safeguard everyone. Since Clumber has charged entrance, everybody is coming here. Most of the dog walkers are very nice and I have got to know them quite well and pass the time of day but there are many people now and one has no idea who they are or what they are doing
1195	4	As you will appreciate, therefore, everyone here feels that the encroachment into the estate would be too much to sustain and cause its demise
1195	5	You also asked me to put forward some ideas for the sad site on the corner of Kilton Road/Retford Road; the abandoned factory -now rubble. I feel that this site has huge potential for a superb mixed re-development as follows: 2 storey units -some houses, some flats with parking spaces underneath them. A grid system of walkways lined with trees or shrubs accessing the canal side, which could also be a wide walk-way, tree-lined with some tasteful shops, e.g. grocery store, pub, restaurant, art gallery/gift shop, chemist and hair dresser with small office units/studios above them. Moorings for the visiting canal boats, who, I have heard do not like that stretch as it now stands and move through as quickly as possible. However, they would definitely make a point of stopping there if it was pretty and inviting to take on stores, have a meal, maybe visit the town too. It would give the residents on the other side of the canal a nice view. All this said, I do realise that redevelopment of the site may entail a clearance of industrial waste which would be expensive. I hope this helps'
1196	1	Agree
1196	2	My view would change 33 houses built in a short period would be far too many for a village like Elkesley. New houses built in the last year have not been sold so why do we need more?
1196	3	247 limited development
1196	4	246 no ridge and furrow grass field
1196	5	249 no too near the A1
1196	6	248 Part development in the future, in line with existing houses
1196	7	As Elkesley already has a good stock of private affordable housing on Headland Avenue and Lawnwood Avenue it does not need any more at the moment and should grow organically as required.
1197	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1197	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1197	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1197	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1197	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1197	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1197	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1197	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1198	1	In 1997 I sought planning permission to develop a parcel of land at Sunfield, Harcourt Place. Permission was not given. I appealed and in 1998 sought the view of the planning inspectorate. That was not successful. The inspector was of the view that there is a danger to pedestrians at the junction of Five Fields Lane, Harcourt Place and Public footpath 36. As you will be aware the footpath borders the Northern Boundary of Area 3. This question of safety was raised in response to the proposal to build one new house at Harcourt Place. If a number of affordable houses are to be built on Area 3 this will surely bring a sharp increase in the use of public footpath 36, particularly by mothers and children seeking access through Five Fields Lane to Grove Coach Road and London Road.
1198	2	I am aware that on at least two occasions in the past planning permission has been refused to the owners of this land. I raised this with one of the planners at the meeting on 23 January to be told "Times have changed". But I would put to you that nothing has changed this area and whatever led the planners to turn down the proposal remains today.
1198	3	You asked for opinions as to where the development of Retford housing should take place. I would prefer to see development take place on the North Road to see developments take place on the North Road, North of the Industrial estate. Here appears to be considerable potential for development.
1198	4	In a recent walk around the square in Retford I became aware of the lack of character when the market is not present. The entire square appears to be commercial. Many small towns on the continent enhance their squares by introducing both commercial and residential presences in their squares. Would this be appropriate for us and make use of some empty and ugly buildings?
1199	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1199	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1199	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1199	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1199	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1199	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1199	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1199	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1200	1	The proposals for future housing in Shireoaks meets with absolute disapproval from my wife and I.
1200	2	As we see it as residents since 1968, the only sensible addition to Shireoaks would be a moderate number of good quality houses to be built on the present marina locations. This location having been already planned to same extent.
1200	3	It would tidy up the area and make it match the rest of our pretty village, and stop the infiltration of travellers occupying the site illegally despite endless attempts to present them.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1201	1	Yes
1201	2	244
1201	3	Site 249 is unsuitable for housing as the noise and pollution from the A1 will adversely affect the quality of life of residents.
1201	4	Site 247 is a valued green space in the centre of the village, because of its position and would better serve the village and enhance the community environment if developed into a community area such as a village green, with ornamental gardens, seats, allotments, bowling green and the like. This view is reflected by the Parish Council attempts to raise money to buy the site at the recent auction. Unfortunately the short public notice of the sale made it impossible for the clerk to arrange the necessary finance in time.
1201	5	Villagers are isolated from amenities and always will be, given poor public transport and rising private transport costs. Therefore it is important to develop such local sites to enhance village life.
1202	1	yes
1202	2	244
1203	1	yes
1203	2	244
1204	1	Yes, and these should be affordable homes
1204	2	Yes, 33 houses are too many in one go. Small infill developments would be better.
1204	3	I think all the sites are suitable for development, however:
1204	4	246 is the best option. If this is built on access should be from 247, from Coal Pit Lane.
1204	5	247. Access should be from Coal Pit Lane. This area is also ideal for a community garden/bowling green and as such should not have more than 11 houses surrounding a central green.
1204	6	Site 249. Any houses built there should have a noise reduction scheme included, due to noise from the A1.
1204	7	Yes, as above. A central green/community garden/bowling green on 247.
1204	8	More affordable housing of a mixed nature for 18/30 age group, families and retired people.
1204	9	Yes, and also part of 247. There are no recreational facilities for the elderly and a community garden/bowling green here would be ideal. It would create a central focus point for the village.
1205	1	Whilst I recognise that the Council need to consider further development and that Blyth has been identified for 9 such properties, I am concerned that anymore than this would lead to an imbalance in the village. Many people choose to live in Blyth because of the nature of the village not in spite of it.
1205	2	178, 213, 214 would be the better option for development as I feel there are serious safety issues regarding access to Retford Road from the other sites.
1205	3	I also feel those areas of the village are less densely populated.
1205	4	I recognised that the infrastructure has been raised as an issue. I feel this needs highlighting once more as does the liability of the drains to support further development.
1205	5	Yes open spaces should be protected.
1206	1	Screening Methodology – details not given so unable to comment
1206	2	Option B: Harworth
1206	3	Agree
1206	4	Site 178
1206	5	Plot no. 266 opens on to Retford Road at the side of my property. This walk through the village is used frequently by children to the playing field, joggers and dog walkers and is a safe spot for all ages. A few years ago the sign which said 'Bridleway' was replaced with the sign 'Public Footpath'. Do laws have to passed for this? Residents were not aware of the change.
1206	6	When the owner cleared the land in December the walk through is now visible near the side of my property. It is part of village history – should be probably on the village green for all to see (not to be broken up).
1206	7	When we purchased the property my solicitor spoke to the highways and confirmed as the enclosed letter from Bassetlaw saying the opening on to Retford Road was to near to the A1 Bridge and access is not suitable. Increase in noise and pollution could qualify for council tax reduction.
1206	8	More houses, more cars, more noise and pollution living in the countryside should have peace and clean air, but the A1 is a blight before you start and all should be considered.
1206	9	Existing sites
1206	10	Together
1206	11	Do not know
1206	12	Footpaths – When are you going to help the disabled that cannot walk but rely on scooter which is dangerous to take on the road, buses are few and far between, nowhere to sit, and too high to climb into. The highways promise to look into it but nothing changes no paths.
1206	13	Plot no 266 would make a lovely park for the village it joins onto the playing field and children's area and would be an asset to the village, maybe a wildlife park.
1207	1	As you are aware, there are already 68 houses being built in Gringley. This is a 23% increase in properties in the village. We need to see the impact that this development has on the village before housing any other developments. The impact includes the school and highways

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1207	2	We do not want to see any future development in the village for 10 years until we come to terms with the impact of the 68 houses.
1208	1	I have examined the plans and the proposal to build 700 new homes is out of all proportion with the existing dwellings, and as the current government thinking is, it is like dumping a new village onto a small community. Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. I gather the existing Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and start to consume Wallingwells area.
1208	2	Provision of utilities and services: should this development go ahead I estimate that it will bring to the area at least 1200 adults, 1000 cars and 900 children there is no way that the existing infrastructure can cope with this demand and a new direct road link would have to be built to Gateford Road.
1208	3	The increased traffic levels on the estate on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
1208	4	I presume the majority of residents will work away from the area and as such will use the A57 which is in places no better than a country lane despite being a main link road between the A1 and the M1.
1208	5	Healthcare and education facilities are already under great pressure with health care being located away from the area. Most other services in the area seem to be at full stretch and improvements to the all important broadband and mobile phone systems are desperate now, without the additional houses.
1208	6	Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
1208	7	Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
1209	1	I've been a long standing resident of North Wheatley and in that time have seen many changes however, I would like to convey that I would only be in favour of small developments that would be in keeping with the village
1209	2	I am aware that the field at the end of my lane no 236 is one of the sites in question and that the lady who owns the paddock running alongside this field would like to contribute a small number of properties towards the 12 proposed by yourselves. I feel this would be a natural extension to the village and would like to express my thoughts to you.
1210	1	600 plus
1210	2	Site reference 182
1211	1	Retford and Worksop: I feel that that the Council is underestimating the number of dwellings that will be built from permissions that are already in place I believe that there is an over allocation of properties to Retford and Worksop.
1211	2	I believe that it is an important and realisable principle that no land should be built upon where any flood risk is identified by the Environment Agency and that the boundaries of Worksop and Retford should not be breached.
1211	3	In particular Gateford should not merge into Carlton and Retford into Clarbrough by extending developments into those villages.
1211	4	Shireoaks and Rhodesia: I support some new build allocation in Rhodesia, but there should not be any significant allocation in Shireoaks.
1211	5	Both Shireoaks and Rhodesia have been included as part of Worksop's allocation. I believe that they should be separately scoped as villages separate to the larger conurbation.
1211	6	Harworth: I believe that the Council has significantly underprovided for Harworth and that Harworth should be allocated additional housing significantly above the identified allocation. It is Harworth that needs major house building, not Retford and Worksop.
1211	7	Villages looking towards Lincoln: I believe that the plan under provides for villages looking towards Lincoln, such as Rampton and Treswell, but especially East Markham. I believe that there is scope for a significant increase in the provision within the East Markham village envelope and a small increase in provision in other South East Bassetlaw villages near the A57.
1211	8	These villages are commutable to Lincoln for employment but also increasingly look to Lincoln for commerce, retail and leisure.
1211	9	I do not support any new traveller and gypsy sites other than those already allocated.
1212	1	We would like the field to the left of site reference 143 to be included in future development (to the left as you look at the map/plan)
1212	2	No gypsy or traveller sites within East Markham
1213	1	Yes
1213	2	Option A
1213	3	Yes they should be 2 bedroom bungalows for older people and first time buyers
1213	4	239 Frontage onto Low Street and Retford Road
1213	5	236 frontage onto Top Pasture Lane
1213	6	237 South West Corner frontage onto adopted section of Top Pasture Lane.
1213	7	Problem with deep drainage
1213	8	Yes definitely
1214	1	Both sites are on drain off sites that flood regularly, water runs off the Grove Hills pools on both of these sites as drainage is woefully inadequate. Both of these sites have been the subject of planning permission before (approx. 15 years ago). Needless to say the BDC sensibly refused this permission for exactly the same reasons as would make it unsatisfactory today. Nothing has changed time except the landowner has negligently refused to maintain even rudimentary drainage as the floods of 2007/ 2010 ably demonstrate

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1214	2	In 1985, When I moved to Retford, I was warned by a family friend, who worked for the Water Board, advised me not to buy a house at the bottom of Bracken lane s the area was already notorious for having sewage and drainage issues. That was 25 years ago and the problems still exist.
1214	3	There is only one school in the area and this is running at full capacity, my grandchild cannot even get into the attached nursery, and according to forecasts is likely to remain so in the foreseeable future. Its sports field floods regularly by the way. There are no play facilities within a 2 mile radius for the children and the school field has become impregnable, fenced off and threatening signage much in evidence. There are no shops or civic amenities for teenagers or young adults. We can boast two pubs and a bus shelter.
1214	4	Bracken Lane turns into a single lane track when it leaves the of the proposed developments but it would be much better to improve this than to send more traffic down the regular routes as they are already far too congested to contemplate more traffic passage. Both Bracken Lane (school end) and Grove Coach Road are horrendously busy (I suggest you do a traffic survey to confirm) at peak times and merely very busy for the rest of the day and evening. It may be possible to widen Bracken Lane at the cost of peoples gardens and the school grounds but Grove Coach Road would be impossible because houses have very small frontages (less than 5 metres) and an avenue of Cherry trees integral to the footpath. Traffic calming slowing measures have already met with little enthusiasm by the Highways departments. This has been raised because of excessive speeds recorded by residents coming from close to the possible building sites
1214	5	However I do not wish just to express merely negative comments so I have studied your consultation paper and maps and would like to recommend that you consider more carefully sites 3 and 27. Both have the possibility to egress directly onto the main road structures. In fact site 27 could empty London Road (as could Site 3) and Grove Road to &lute the impact of traffic leaving estates at peak times
1214	6	I believe the land rises somewhat on these sites away from in the flood meadows and it would be straight forward to counter flood worries from the very beginning without trying to 'patch prove' existing facilities.
1214	7	Equally sewage and water supplies would be laid as state of art solutions with built in development possibilities to cope with planned and future needs.
1214	8	Roads could be creatively planned from a blank canvas and width, safety of old and young would 'It into the plans from the very beginning. I do hope this is of some value to you in your difficult decision making process
1215	1	Assuming each new house had at least 3 residents, including 1 child of school age, and at least 1 car this would mean: The population of the area growing significantly. 600 additional school places to be found in an area where the schools are already over-subscribed. At least 600 additional cars on the local roads. In consequence this would mean:
1215	2	The character of the area will be massively altered
1215	3	Local infrastructure will be seriously strained
1215	4	Traffic levels will hugely increase
1215	5	A substantial loss of wildlife habitat
1215	6	In addition to the objections to the increase in residents we also raise the issue that there have been on going flood problems in this area. In 2007 several properties suffered serious flood damage. The area has to cope with excessive drainage from Grove Hills, and the land has always been subject to a flood plain.
1215	7	The area that we live in is currently a quiet, safe neighbourhood which many of us have chosen for our children to grow up in and we have paid a premium to do so. There are public footpaths that the local community enjoy and these would also be lost. Why ruin this area of natural beauty to build yet more houses in Retford when there are already so many new builds that are empty?
1215	8	Not only are there a significant number of new empty properties, there is also a lack of jobs and industry in the area, so where are all the extra people going to be employed?
1216	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
1216	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
1216	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
1216	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
1216	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
1216	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
1216	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
1216	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
1217	1	We need it leaving as a golf course not for houses people need a place to play golf with friends not for houses. Also as a playing field for football

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1218	1	I would like to make comment of the proposed development on Low Street Gringley. I was very dubious at the thought of any more development in Gringley due to the large scale building on the old HM Borstal site.
1218	2	However after looking at the proposed site layout that Mr Limit showed me, and saw that a substantial piece of land would be landscaped and donated to the council, and that there would be only six houses tucked away at the back of the field, away from the road. I now think that it would be a good idea to develop there, and am writing this letter to show me support for future development in years to come.
1218	3	I have lived in this village for 63 years, and seen many people come and go, and have raised objections myself, to some developments, however this proposed development on Low Street seems to be less obtrusive than many I have seen and good for the future of the village with there being a large landscaped green area to the front for residents in the village to admire.
1218	4	It made me laugh when I spoke to some residents in Beach Close when they said to me “we don’t want any building behind us, making a noise and having muck and dust for two years while they build” and I said to them, you forget you live in a cul-de-sac, directly opposite me! And I had to put up with the building works while Beach Close was being built. It seems its ok for them to have housing built for themselves, but not for anyone else. The term nimby comes to mind.
1219	1	Main Street, Harworth including the crossroads has severe flooding after 12 hours of heavy rain and after 20 minutes of thunderstorm rain. I have lived in this flood plain from birth until 1973 when I converted my house and lifted it almost 2 metres to escape the flood water. The reason for this flooding is because the surface water drain is inadequate and the Harworth Dyke which flows past the churchyard is unable to take any more water from further housing developments without extensive widening and deepening as far as the River Torne. The flooding has increased in the recent years owing to housing development and residents creating hard standings in gardens for cars. It is vital that future development does not have its water discharging into any drain or culvert which conveys water under Main Street. The alternative is for water to be converted to the River Idle –east of Bircotes or to the Willoughby Dyke which flows South West of the A1M and which has the capacity for taking further water.
1219	2	Regarding further housing development to the North and East of Harworth/Bircotes plots 182,194,187, 191 this area is prime agricultural land capable of growing crops such as cereals, potatoes, carrots and brassicas, due to the large fields and underground irrigation and should not be built upon.
1219	3	The Western side of plot 182 is totally unacceptable for housing development due to the close proximity to Harworth Sewage Works has failed to stem the stench.
1219	4	Plots 180 and 204 are site of the ancient settlement of Harworth where foundations still remain. This site should be listed as a site of “special archaeological interest”. The church stands well-appointed above this field in an attractive and pleasant position and building here would have a great impact on public visual amenity.
1219	5	The Western end of the plot 193 is a grass paddock where horse and cattle graze. There is a public right of way running diagonally across this field. To build houses here would have a severe impact on the lives of the public including residents and families with children who regularly walk here and enjoy the flora and fauna of the only grass field with a public right of way across it in Harworth.
1219	6	Plot 190 is the field which has a spoil heap from the Colliery. For 40 years residents and visitors to the area have had to look at this eye sore. The planting of trees and shrubs on this site has created an attractive and pleasant environment. It would be detrimental to the people of Harworth and Bircotes to lose this ecological habitats and landscapes in favour of house building.
1219	7	With regards to the number of houses required to built, my opinion is that planning permission granted on the West of the village. In the past the majority of the development has taken place on the North East. Housing to the West would provide a better balance, plots 358, 359,205, 206, 207, 181. The surface water from such a development would drain into the Willoughby Dyke behind the motorway. These plots are small fields and uneconomic to farm with modern machinery making the sites ideal for housing development.
1219	8	Further housing ought to be infilling within the natural boundary of the village plot 184, 185, 186, 188 and the eastern end of 193. All surface from these plots should run into soak ways to avoid flooding Harworth village.
1219	9	Plot 192 is poor scrubland and should be considered for house building to make up the number of houses required.
1219	10	All the potential protected open space coloured green on the maps should be retained. I believe the land to the south of the village should be used for industrial and not mixed development. In my opinion the plot nearest Blyth roundabout should be for storage and distribution and the plots adjacent to the old Glass Bulbs for industry and employment.
1219	11	The land to the north of plot 190 adjacent to Scrooby Road is the site of the Old Brickworks in Harworth I am surprised that this is at the advanced planning stage of planning permission, because when I was young I remember deep ponds where clay had been taken out. In the years between 1940 and 1955 these deep ponds were then filled in with household refuse by Worksop District Rural Council. The brickyard house and kilns were buried underneath this rubbish in places up to 20ft deep. I fail to see how this site could be suitable for building works without carrying out a geological survey to ascertain stability before detailed planning permission was given. I would not personally live in a house on this site at any price.
1220	1	Question 1 -Screening Methodology -this is very difficult for the 'layman' to understand and comment upon, but I feel that some sites which may be suitable / preferable have been screened out for the wrong reasons e.g. not currently for sale, and yet this is a plan for the next 20 years!
1220	2	However, I fully agree with criterion 1 regarding public opinion. This should be given the highest priority and only in exceptional circumstances should development take place against the wishes of the local population.
1220	3	Question 9 -The allocation of more housing in the town should be controlled and based upon local public support and need, not greed of the developers.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1220	4	Question 10 -Development should take place on brown field sites and not green field sites. There is plenty of small in-fill which could take place within the town area of Retford which would go a long way to meeting the target number of increased housing. For example apartments in the canal side warehouse (Discount Cycles) which would greatly enhance the area and raise few objections. Also the King Edward School site, St Alban's Church site, the building once used as the Working Men's Club and the new privately owned car park opposite the Little Theatre, could all be developed with little objection, lots of public support and greatly enhance the town centre
1220	5	Moving to the periphery of the Retford area is the Bramcote Lawn school site. This has good local access as well as access to the A1 and to Retford and would not encroach on the local village of Gamston, as it is a distance away. The newly built Gamston primary school appears to have room for expansion and the nearby secondary school of Tuxford could be reached with ease as there are already transport links in place. A significant number of properties could be accommodated on this site.
1220	6	Question 14 -The open spaces identified should be protected and more should be ~added to this list, including the agricultural land listed as sites 489, 488, 511, 370 and 3.
1220	7	Question 15 -Sites 489, 488, 511, 370 and 3 should definitely NOT be developed for the following reasons:-
1220	8	Flood risk -this land has flooded frequently over recent years and building on it will merely make this problem worse.
1220	9	Local road access problems -Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road are already very busy roads with issues regarding parking and exiting out onto London Road and any development of these sites can only make this problem worse.
1220	10	Any development on these sites will impact negatively on the local landscape's character. The sites mentioned above are all classed as "conserve" in the Bassetlaw Landscape Assessment. Therefore, development should not take place (criterion 6).
1220	11	Under Criterion 8 any development will significantly detract from the existing green infrastructure of this area. These fields with their trees, hedgerows and ditches are a haven for wildlife -newts, toads, frogs, water voles etc. All of this will be lost if development takes place here due to the loss of trees, hedgerows, ecological habitats and landscape.
1220	12	Question 121 - If the local people are happy and the Travelling community is happy, then perhaps it is better to concentrate development around existing traveller sites
1220	13	Question 153 -A few years ago a very tidy and well maintained Traveller site was set up next to the A1 south of Elkesley at the junction with the Walesby / Ollerton Road. This must have been an unofficial site, as it disappeared after a while, but it was in a position which did not seem to create any problems.
1221	1	We note that the District Development Plan is being drawn up for the next few years. We have nothing to add to how the information has been collated and we congratulate Bassetlaw District Council on the efforts made to obtain the wishes of the population before formulating the document. Quantum Construction Services Limited would be pleased if Bassetlaw District Council would consider including the area at the top of Infield Lane as an acceptable area for private development. The site is currently a disused industrial chicken rearing shed and as such is brown field. We would like to upgrade Infield Lane with surfacing; speed humps and lighting al1d develop the site of the chicken with individual dwellings primarily for persons over 50 years of age. These dwellings would be prefabricated and designed to achieve the highest possible thermal efficiency. They would have roof solar panels and ground source heat pumps with a view to making themselves as near carbon neutral as possible. The area will be paved with a block paving that is SUDS compliant so as not to overload the watercourse and each dwelling will have its own mini sewage system to avoid overloading the drainage system. Once these dwellings are erected and demonstrated to be as environmentally friendly as possible, constructed from 100% British made materials and erected by a workforce 100% Bassetlaw based we would intend to approach Bassetlaw District Council and AI Housing to explore the possibilities of a Partnering Agreement whereby Quantum Construction Services Limited provide the turn-key service of infrastructure, dwelling construction and maintenance for very low energy cost accommodation.
1222	1	I agree that enough land should be allocated in Walkeringham for 14 new houses.
1222	2	I would not wish to see any large scale development in the village.
1222	3	Site reference number 286 is in our ownership and we have made a case for use of part of the site for up to 3 dwellings.
1222	4	1 have considered all the site on the Walkeringham potential development sites plan and my preferred development sites plan and my preferred option is site number 286 because if its road access and location.
1222	5	I am not aware of any further relevant issues.
1222	6	I think that the open spaces identified on the map should be protected from any future development.
1222	7	Criterion 1: One of the views expressed in the residents questionnaire suggested that small extensions to the village would be preferable to large extensions or infilling between the development boundary lines. Our site located near the edge of the village and suited for limited development could receive the support of the local community in this respect.
1222	8	There has been no independent consultation with the local community to gauge support for the development of the site. Our original submission stated a case for one dwellings on the site, this was based on the fact that it is in the vicinity of three listed building and it was felt that, although the site would accommodate more, it would not be acceptable to build more dwellings affecting the landscape. And the character of the approach to the village.
1222	9	We believe that this approach would receive community support and we would be flexible in agreeing to a further two dwellings to be constructed to be designated for local people if the site was selected to provide a proportion of the 14 new dwellings for Walkeringham.
1222	10	Criterion 2: Inline with the core strategy it is assumed that this rural site would only be considered as a potential housing site and as such we would ensure that it was compatible with its surroundings.
1222	11	Criterion 4: The site is greenfield which has only been used for grazing/cutting for hay. The development of this land would not result in the loss of good agricultural land.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1222	12	Criterion 5: It is understood that full information on the differentials of land grading is not available in Bassetlaw however the nature of the site and evidence of the water table at the southern extremity of the site would seem to confirm the above.
1222	13	It is understood that the environment agency have the necessary mapping extraction information to enable Bassetlaw to assess each site to ensure that the development does not have an adverse effect on water quality and does not pose a contamination threat.
1222	14	Criterion 6: The site is located in the vicinity of the manor house, the stables and the parish church, all of which are listed buildings.
1222	15	There are protected tree in the garden of the stables , the trees are in the northern end of the site and will be preserved.
1222	16	It is understood that the northern third of the site is an area of archaeological interest and would therefore be the subject of a survey. We will ensure that the local character is protected and that careful consideration will be given to the design and site layout of any building in the development to make sure that they are compatible with the neighbouring buildings so that the character of the landscape is not just preserved but enhanced.
1222	17	We would also like to incorporate a landscaping scheme with the inclusion of further trees.
1222	18	Criterion 7: A development of several dwellings of appropriate design would enhance the character of the neighbourhood. The development would have a positive impact my making use of low grade agricultural land for housing.
1222	19	Criterion 8: As previously stated our initial submission identified our wish for a single dwellings in our paddock. As well as preserving the character and the landscape this proposal was based on preserving the green infrastructure of the paddock and the neighbourhood. We wish to preserve the woodland at the southern end of the paddock as well as maintaining all the trees and hedgerows.
1222	20	To meet this criteria we would be flexible in developing the site along the lines of the original submission or adding a further two dwellings to provide housing for local people.
1222	21	It is felt that minim development as outline above could, if accepted, price three of the total allocation of 14 dwellings as well as enhancing the existing green infrastructure.
1222	22	The layout of the development would be such that the dwellings could be set back to the western side of the land thereby maintaining open spaces for the public wildlife that is present on our land (barns owls, pheasants, partridges and moorhens).
1222	23	Criterion 9: At this stage we have not identified any constraints to the delivery of the site, there are two means of access to the site i.e. the main drive to the house and a dedicated access to the paddock which incorporates a dropped kerb and abridged entrance which was provided by Bassetlaw District Council several years ago
1222	24	A main drains runs from west to east at the southern end of the site which subject to further site investigations could possibly service the development.
1223	1	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitants for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
1223	2	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
1223	3	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
1223	4	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
1223	5	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
1223	6	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
1223	7	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
1223	8	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
1224	1	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitants for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
1224	2	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
1224	3	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1224	4	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
1224	5	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
1224	6	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
1224	7	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
1224	8	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
1225	1	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
1225	2	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
1225	3	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
1225	4	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
1225	5	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
1225	6	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
1225	7	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
1225	8	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
1226	1	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
1226	2	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
1226	3	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
1226	4	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
1226	5	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
1226	6	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
1226	7	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
1226	8	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1227	1	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
1227	2	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
1227	3	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
1227	4	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
1227	5	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
1227	6	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
1227	7	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
1227	8	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
1228	1	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
1228	2	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
1228	3	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
1228	4	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.
1228	5	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
1228	6	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
1228	7	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
1228	8	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
1229	1	In particular I wish to strongly object to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons. A) A great loss of amenity. It would have a detrimental effect on existing residents' and visitors' visual and physical enjoyment of this rich landscape, which is a mixture of ancient hedgerows, copses and woodland. The rich mosaic of habitats for animal and birds would be lost. This area is irreplaceable – something no open space or park could replace – and a very much valued asset, there would be a loss of open walkways and bridleways which many people enjoy – both residents and visitors.
1229	2	B) Urban sprawl and extension of the town boundary. Current housing already extends to the existing Worksop town boundary. Development of site 35 will extend beyond the boundary and encroach on Wallingwells and Carlton in Lindrick. Additional housing will lead to too much density in an area that has sufficient housing.
1229	3	C) A loss of nature conservation. The effect on Owday and Whipman Woods and Owday Plantation, which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation would be catastrophic.
1229	4	D) There is an opportunity cost for our children's education. There will be less chance to learn the importance of the natural by having pertinent exposure to this environment. They currently use this amenity to help them understand that beyond the urban sprawl there are farms, wild animals and birds to observe and understand. Here, they have it on their doorstep and are exposed to the whole beauty of nature. It is a learning environment and they can see the land farmed and the crops grow. This areas must be preserved for our community.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1229	5	E) Safety Issues. There will be increased danger from traffic. The number of cars would increase dramatically. At present residents and visitors use this land and take their families for lovely countryside walks where they are safe.
1229	6	F) More congestion and pollution. At present our local shops are busy and are utilised well by the local community. More housing will most certainly lead to local congestion. It is not viable to reach the proposed new large supermarkets from this site on foot and this would then lead to increased traffic to and from the town. There will also be extra noise and pollution from the increased traffic
1229	7	G) Loss of agriculture and employment. Currently this land is agricultural and productive and it supports the employment of land workers.
1229	8	H) Infrastructure and Services. Increased density of housing and population will put a strain on local infrastructure and resources, for example doctors, dentists and other healthcare services. Electricity, gas, water, sewerage will have to be provided and significantly upgraded again leading to destruction of the environment.
1230	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
1230	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
1230	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
1230	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
1230	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
1230	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
1230	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
1230	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
1231	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
1231	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
1231	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
1231	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
1231	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
1231	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
1231	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
1231	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
1232	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
1232	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
1232	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
1232	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
1232	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1232	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
1232	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
1232	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
1233	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
1233	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
1233	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
1233	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
1233	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
1233	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
1233	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
1233	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
1234	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
1234	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
1234	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
1234	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
1234	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
1234	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
1234	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
1234	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
1235	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
1235	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
1235	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
1235	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
1235	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1235	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
1235	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
1235	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
1236	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
1236	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
1236	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
1236	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
1236	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
1236	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
1236	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
1236	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
1237	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
1237	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
1237	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
1237	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
1237	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
1237	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
1237	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
1237	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
1238	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1238	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
1238	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
1238	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
1238	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
1238	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
1238	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
1238	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
1239	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
1239	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
1239	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
1239	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
1239	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
1239	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
1239	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
1239	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
1240	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
1240	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
1240	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
1240	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
1240	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
1240	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1240	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
1240	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
1241	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
1241	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
1241	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
1241	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
1241	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
1241	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
1241	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
1241	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.
1242	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any houses at site 35 based on the below reasons: The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. Any increase in housing on the estate will make this situation intolerable and dangerous to residents and visitors.
1242	2	Increased traffic levels on the estate generally reducing the quality of our environment, increasing noise levels, pollution and increasing danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
1242	3	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape.
1242	4	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
1242	5	The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
1242	6	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment.
1242	7	This bridleway is used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users. The loss of this countryside would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Plantation.
1242	8	Our local shops which are sited off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, especially as one of the shops became an ASDA. Additional housing will cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas.
1242	9	Our local schools (primary, secondary and school based nurseries) are already at capacity.
1243	1	Paragraphs 2:16, 2:17 and 2:18 refer to the suitability and acceptance of sites and although it clearly states that it is not the LPA's intention to rank sites, that is exactly what the "traffic light" system does as those with the highest number of "green lights" will be regarded as more desirable.
1243	2	Criterion 1 - Local community involvement will become more important in the future, however we can all cite examples where a Parish Council has been supportive of one particular developer and not so supportive of another. Parish Councils, by their volunteer nature, are not as transparent as a District Council and friendships or grievances can play a greater part in decision making at parish level.
1243	3	Also community views are prone to change fairly rapidly and if future policies are to rely on a greater level of community involvement then both policies and development boundary lines will have to be very flexible if we are going to be able to respond to not only local community changes but also to changes in national policy and national guidance. However restrictive these documents and policies are now, they should be capable of fairly rapid reappraisal should the need be present.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1243	4	Criterion 2 - In general terms, I agree with this philosophy. However, we should not preclude the possibilities of an innovative form of development that may allow uses previously not considered acceptable to be used together. In Holland, for instance, residential sits side by side with industrial in many larger and smaller towns. The secret appears to be an understanding of what both halves bring to the development and a better form of “housekeeping” for the industrial partner.
1243	5	Criterion 3 - I agree with this but as stated elsewhere, allocations for employment have to be turned into actual starts and occupancies. It would be nice to have policies that actually welcome development rather than the restrictive format that we see presently. Inward investment tends to go to areas that either have financial inducements or policies that start with a presumption in favour of development, much as in the NPPF document.
1243	6	Criterion 4 - The best agricultural land should generally be retained for crop production but I am not quite sure about Natural England’s Agricultural Land Classification. If this equates to the Defra classification then that is acceptable as this classification refers to land and crop production. Natural England, on the other hand, considers land values in a different light and crop production is just one aspect.
1243	7	If we are saving land for crop production then that should be the sole requirement under this criterion. Natural habitat and wildlife are something different and should be considered outside crop value criteria.
1243	8	Criterion 5 - Given that the majority of Bassetlaw’s major settlements are in a Source Protection Zone and the majority of our industrial/commercial development will be sited in these areas, it appears that not a single site will achieve a green light. I sincerely hope this is not a major stumbling block to would be investors. It is right of course that pollution should not happen but technology and advances in construction techniques and materials can eliminate these risks. I do not see this criterion as being anything other than unhelpful and unnecessary. There is other legislation (Environmental Protection Act) that can deal with this issue and in reality there should not really be a crossover of control from planning legislation to environmental legislation and vice versa.
1243	9	Criterion 6 - Certain important landscape features and areas should be conserved but others should be more open to change particularly when that change brings benefits both to the community and to wildlife and habitat production.
1243	10	Criterion 7 - This, like others of the criteria, tends to prejudge development. It is a little difficult to understand how any development can be assessed at this stage as being detrimental to the character of the existing built form of the settlement or neighbourhood. It precludes good design and good layout which is what we are now advised to put at the top of our list. Good design can generally overcome many concerns regarding assimilation of development into an area. When Council houses were first constructed in our villages I am sure these would have been totally out of character with the settlement but now generally they are part and parcel of the village. Design is only one aspect, employment can help to enhance the character of the area but to do this the character needs to be assessed first. There are some villages that have now become purely dormitories for people working in cities. This has been allowed to happen over the last 10-20 years.
1243	11	The vast majority of character zoning in Bassetlaw would appear to fall within the zone to conserve landscape. It is therefore clear that any development in this area will not score well on the traffic light system. This would appear to be another simple method to be employed by the LPA to prevent development, a further example of restrictive policies. Therefore, in my view, much more work should be undertaken to establish baseline character assessments of the towns and villages before any judgement can be made.
1243	12	Criterion 8 - I tend to agree with this statement.
1243	13	Criterion 9 - I find myself troubled by this criterion. Firstly, the cost of infrastructure provision usually falls to the developer and as with all on costs to the development (CIL, S106 Affordable Housing) the developer simply reduces the amount paid to the landowner. If the land value continues to fall due to market price and also additional development costs then the land will not be released. The sites most likely to give rise to pressure on infrastructure and services are the larger sites not the small sites producing 1-5 units, yet under the new proposals all sites will be paying towards these problems.
1243	14	I believe also that infrastructure providers e.g. Highways, Severn Trent Water for potable water and in particular sewage pipework etc., sit back and wait for development to take place so that the developer team can foot the bill for some of the upgrades that the service provider should have been doing as normal maintenance. All these providers with the exception of Highways are public companies and as such are not answerable to the man in the street but solely to their shareholders. There should be baseline assessments provided and clear evidence of maintenance schedules from all of these bodies and companies so we (general public, ratepayers, developers, landowners etc.) can be assured that the sums of money are warranted and not just income for service providers to assist with company revenue.
1243	15	Nor do I think that any of these service providers carry out any meaningful assessment to assist the LPA in considering sites rather they lay down a cautionary “no”. Recently in a neighbouring authority, Nottinghamshire County Council commented on a site allocation that “there may be visibility issues”. This site was therefore initially not included as a preferred site although it ticked all the right boxes as a mixed use site and was very deliverable and in the right location. Nottinghamshire County Council did not investigate this issue, just place something akin to their old “holding objection” but it was enough. Simple measurements were taken on site and it was shown that there was not any issue with visibility and the LPA are now considering the promotion of this site. A clear indication that advice from certain “authorities” and service providers can be poor at best, lazy in its extreme with little or no regard for the problem it can create. Access constraints can often be mitigated by investigation, the question is at what stage does this become necessary? I think a much more flexible approach to constraints should be adopted.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1243	16	I think the whole of the district should receive more both in terms of employment and housing. The basic precept that we have maximum growth targets is not well founded. The housing figures themselves are based on the RSS document and the Council's own housing register shows a need of 4839 homes for people on their register. Worksop can and should take more, as should Retford and Harworth but not at the expense of the rural district. If there is to be a target set the target should be one that can deliver the number of affordable homes required. In terms of employment growth, again there should not be an upper limit. If companies are willing to establish in the area they should be welcomed, rather than be confronted with a document that is somewhat negative and less engaging. Both housing and employment land levels should therefore be flexible to respond to demand.
1243	17	Site No. 45.
1243	18	Site No. 45.
1243	19	Site No. 45. This site adjoins a much larger mixed use and employment site and could form part of a larger mixed use provision.
1243	20	No comment.
1243	21	The affordable housing requirements in Worksop and Harworth according to the draft supplementary planning document are 15%. Given that these 2 towns together have been allocated the lion's share of housing numbers, it would seem that more affordable housing could be provided within those communities and given that generally those in need of affordable houses are at the lower end of the pay structure then the majority of this affordable housing should be allocated in those towns where services and facilities are readily available and usable yet the requirement level is 10% less than Retford and 20% less than Tuxford. Larger sites will have the inherent value capable of affording these additional high charges whereas the other areas have smaller sites, higher land value, lower numbers but larger contribution costs. This will not produce increase in affordable homes, it will however set development back and make land owners and developers think twice, but of course this may be the true agenda!! In the 2 other zones you will not get large housing sites with the possible exception of Retford. The group including Worksop and Harworth have been allocated 4487 dwellings which would produce 673 affordable homes, the group with Retford in it has been allocated 2106 and will produce 527 affordable homes and the latter group with Beckingham, Dunham, East Markham etc. have been allocated 406 which will yield 142 affordable homes. It would appear that these figures have been structured this way to raise the maximum revenue from rural properties by way of commuted sums because rural properties command a greater price. The LPA should be clear and transparent in their reasoning. It would appear unfair that one section of the district is expected to contribute more than any other.
1243	22	No comment.
1243	23	Yes I do. It is the only large town in the affordable housing group that could deliver meaningful sized sites.
1243	24	Sites No. 46 and No. 309. On the north east edge of the town there are several potential housing sites, all of them are in open countryside except this allocation and this is surrounded on at least 3 sides by residential development.
1243	25	Longholme Road swings round right to the edge of this site to an existing access point. It would appear from the layout of Longholme Road that there has always been an intention for housing to be continued round this site.
1243	26	The map only shows mixed use sites. I do not feel anything like the necessary consideration has been given to employment creating opportunities in Retford. There seems to have been a very real desire in the past to lose our employment sites and to throw all the eggs into the Randall Way basket which appears to be promoting smaller units rather than larger. However, if this is the area to be preferred then the remainder of the sites on the A638 on both sides should be retained for employment with care being exercised with the type of employment development sited here.
1243	27	Retford has little by way of social infrastructure. If it is truly to be a sustainable town then effort should be made to ensure the social side and well being of the inhabitants is catered for.
1243	28	From appraising the map I would suggest that the open spaces identified are not all used nor usable open spaces. There is a large swathe of land to the south of Goosemoor Lane which has been identified as open space. Part of it is a private football pitch, part of it is nursery growing land and the remainder is agricultural and with the exception of a public footpath over the agricultural land there is no public open space.
1243	29	On the opposite side (north east) and abutting the railway there are 2 more other tracks of scrubland, none of them serve a purpose other than a nominal amount of horticultural activity. Development of these sites possibly for office or business use together with a high level of landscaping and planting could bring opportunities and environmental gain. If the question was to be asked of the residents of Retford whether they wanted jobs or the retention of scrubland, I am fairly certain of the answer.
1243	30	In line with the general shortfall of houses in the district, any upward movement in numbers provided should be welcomed along with any increase in employment provision. In all cases, however, employment provision should be seen as only one aspect in securing jobs. Harworth due to its close proximity to South Yorkshire could be part of cross district collaboration.
1243	31	Employment only as Harworth could be our major employment area providing jobs for the district, much as the colliery did before its demise.
1243	32	Additional open space and landscaping schemes should be incorporated within ALL new sites, both employment and residential. The existing open spaces would appear to be in the main residential areas where their value can be better utilised.
1243	33	The problems with the existing allocations, particularly on the old Newell Dunfords site, are both location and house type, location because it is remote from the village centre and house types because of design. A considerable part of this site should have been retained for employment and community use. There are available sites within the village core itself that would lend themselves to housing provision rather than sites on the perimeter of the village.
1243	34	The site I wish to promote is not on the plan but is located at land to the rear of 27a High Street.
1243	35	This site also could be used as a mixed use site in conjunction with the adjoining retail site.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1243	36	I think the problem with the majority of the potential housing sites on the map is that with the exception of Site No. 107 they are all in open countryside and Site No. 101 that is part in the developed area and part open countryside but it is the only site that is brown field and could deliver both housing and commercial and also community development. Site No. 101 also brings other community and environmental improvements by way of relocating the existing industrial allocations to the rear of the site and installing highway improvements including a possible pelican crossing over the dual carriageway.
1243	37	Site No. 107 is a small site already within the village, its sympathetic development would echo the residential development at the north west end of the village adjacent to that roundabout. It would appear a natural “rounding off” form of development and could certainly deliver the number of houses the LPA are suggesting may be required. It does not add at present to the character of the area nor is it required as an open space, sufficient is provided on the recreation ground opposite. It is an ideal site for providing residential accommodation in line with the traditional format that is present in Beckingham now and it does not add pressure for the release of greenfield sites for development.
1243	38	Given my answer to Q36 above, I strongly promote Sites No. 101 and No. 107
1243	39	Yes, this is a recent planning permission supported by evidence, therefore its use as a Public House should not only be protected it should be promoted.
1243	40	Sites 6/2, 6/3, 6/4 and 6/7 should all be protected.
1243	41	There is a further possible site location near to the White Swan Public House. The site is north east of the pub and adjacent to the existing mobile home site. At present it is an amenity area for the owners of the pub and has a large pond. This site would be suitable for a small number of dwellings set far enough back from the road to have no detrimental impact whatsoever both on the general village character and more importantly on the setting of the nearby listed building.
1243	42	If included, the site above could also provide further amenity area.
1243	43	Everton is a village that could support more dwellings, “at least” 13 suggests a minimum, more, arguably, could be both required and accommodated.
1243	44	No, my view would not change. Sites No. 296 and No. 453 are obvious candidates to provide further residential accommodation. These should be seen as providing existing numbers with further allocations for the 13+ suggested.
1243	45	Those sites that continue the present form of the village rather than extend into great swathes of open countryside.
1243	46	Certainly the area known as the Metcalfe Recreation Ground should be preserved. This not only has community value but also historical value.
1243	47	On the face of it, 5 new houses in Gamston may appear sufficient. However, if the potential opportunity site (previously Bramcote House School) becomes a mixed use site then further dwellings could be provided here.
1243	48	It is difficult to understand why the LPA would wish to allocate the playing fields etc. to the now disused Bramcote House School as open space and then allocate the built format of the school as a potential opportunity site. If this is truly to be an opportunity site then restrictions such as this open space allocation should not be introduced. Gamston as a village settlement in the countryside has plenty of access to public footpaths and river walks without this huge great expanse of open space. The village is close to and has good service links to Retford and commercial uses which require large grounds may be suitable here. Such designations can only put off prospective purchasers. If the LPA and local community are concerned that the removal of this open space designation will lead to a rash of houses being built then they have the tools to prevent this but if another school came along or a research company or hotel chain or whatever, they should be allowed some area of expansion, not limitation.
1243	49	15 new houses over a proposed plan period up to 2028 is not enough. North Leverton has all the facilities for growth. It has a good primary and infants school, a shop, employment, pub, doctors surgery and until recently a police house. This coupled with its good social infrastructure including football teams etc. lends it to further development. This level of development provides approximately 1 house per year. How is this level going to sustain the village and its facilities?
1243	50	Sites No. 200 and No. 262 could go some way to providing good quality housing within the existing village settlement.
1243	51	Sites No. 164 and No. 165 adjoining the newly rebuilt housing site known as Hawthorne Close and Bramble Close forms a natural extension to this part of the site. Both of these sites could provide meaningful areas of development for larger scale
1243	52	I think 14 new houses is an absolute minimum given Ranskill’s location on a main road and close to Robin Hood Airport with its anticipated growth. Once again, this level of development equates to less than 1 house per year. How is this a sustainable level of development? The Post Office has already closed, the pub is up for sale, the garage moved many years ago, all the signs are there that Ranskill, like many other villages, needs investment and development to “keep the dream alive”.
1243	53	Site No. 156 is best placed to provide housing for the near future for Ranskill. In terms of location, it is already in the built up part of the village, it is close to ALL the social service provisions including shops and school etc., it is surrounded on 3 sides by housing and on the fourth side by the rail track thus preventing encroachment outside the village and into open countryside.
1243	54	It is brown field land being the large garden to “High Gables” and is therefore not using up greenfield sites and is in accordance with the wishes declared in the responses received.
1243	55	The owner of Site No. 156 has informed me that when your document was first published there was an active campaign by certain Parish Councillors to resist further development in Ranskill particularly of this site. This was personal and should play no part in these responses. The Councillor concerned is no longer on the Parish Council.
1243	56	A sensible look at the plan of Ranskill shows Sites No. 157, 224, 234 and 537 as being considered, they are all in open countryside. The only sites within the existing built environment are Sites No. 156 and No. 516 and I am given to understand No. 516 already has planning permission for one dwelling. This site should therefore not be considered which only leaves Site No. 156. This site can obviously deliver the minimum number of dwellings the village requires and more. It should therefore be the only site worthy of consideration.

Reference number		Answer
Response number	Comment	
1243	57	Proposed allocation Site No. 537 takes the village beyond the railway line and is accessed down Station Road. Station Road with the existing housing site off Willow Avenue now has about as much vehicular traffic as it can cope with.
1243	58	Further expansion down Station Road should not be considered without alternative means of access being proposed.
1243	59	I am not sure about the open space allocations shown as 39/1 and 39/6, certainly 39/6 is the site earmarked for the new Village Hall. It is difficult to understand how this can be classified as open space. Furthermore, because the Parish Council and the LPA have designated part of this site as suitable for development there is automatically a reduction in the open space the LPA are proposing. I think this needs a rethink and possibly remove 39/6, dependent upon the essential needs of open space expressed by the local community.
1243	60	No, this is a ludicrously low figure. How can any body or individual come up with the figure of 4 new houses over the plan period to 2028? The criteria used to arrive at this figure must have been very exact indeed. The committed housing sites from the map appear to be a single small allocation which may or may not be already underway. This village, as with all the others that are designated to have zero or near to zero growth, will stagnate.
1243	61	Site No. 275 could deliver the level of housing suggested for Sutton and also include the restoration of a small range of agricultural buildings. It should be promoted in preference to any of the other sites that extend the village boundary into open countryside.
1243	62	Yes, modest expansion of existing sites is preferable to new sites.
1243	63	Firstly, there should be a distinction made between gypsies and travellers on the one hand and show people on the other. Gypsies and travellers, by their name, suggests a nomadic, mobile lifestyle and as such transit pitches only should be provided. If they wish to put down roots in a village or town then they should be subjected to the same controls and requirements as other migrants coming into the area. They should buy a house or build a house but without positive levels of discrimination. Show people are somewhat different and their work has a season within which they do move about the country. In the off-season they require to store and maintain their equipment and vehicles and need a permanent location, therefore residential pitches are required.
1243	64	The criteria used to establish the number of residential pitches should be scrutinised to ensure proper and correct use and for show people only.
1243	65	If the use of static pitches is allowed for residential use for gypsies and travellers then the same should be allowed for homeless persons or persons
1243	66	Site No. 45, Shireoaks - This site has major benefits over other proposed allocations. It is directly accessible from the roundabout on Worksop ring road, it has ring road frontage, it is in an area that has been historically considered for development.
1243	67	It is well served by services,
1243	68	It is highly suited for a mixed use site and most of all it is immediately available.
1243	69	Sites No. 46 and No. 309, Retford- In terms of location, this proposed allocation is on the north/north east of the town. Beyond its boundaries are 3 further proposed allocations, Sites No. 7, No. 37 and No. 512. These latter 3 proposals extend directly into open countryside whereas Sites No. 46 and No. 309 nestle inside edges of development. Initially this site was only partially available because of the presence of a SINC on the lower portion of the site. This has been removed and the land redesignated without the SINC.
1243	70	In terms of service facility, all are present and it is well located for the town itself and could deliver a large proportion of the housing numbers suggested for Retford.
1243	71	Site No. 107, Beckingham - Given the small number of houses that Beckingham is destined to get if the numbers are confirmed then this site bounded on all sides by roads would go a long way to achieving this requirement without any extension into open countryside. The physical boundaries of the site prevent further expansion in the future and therefore density and provision can be well controlled.
1243	72	Site No. 262, North Leverton - This site is ideally suited to provide the necessary housing numbers suggested for the village. At present it is brownfield being garden to the cottage already on site and it is on the right side of the road away from potential flooding from the beck.
1243	73	Site No. 156, Ranskill - The proposed site allocations for Ranskill with the exception of Site No. 156 are all beyond existing village boundaries, not just envelope lines but actually beyond the built form of the village. Site No. 156 settles nicely within the built up area, with the only side open to the countryside is bounded by the main east coast railway line thus preventing any expansion. Given the nominal numbers of houses proposed for the village at present, this site would be able to provide these with little or no change to the character of the area, the single difference would be the removal of one frontage dwelling to afford access.
1243	74	It is well provided for services and it would appear to have the backing of the community.
1244	1	I think Elkesley is in need of a few modern style 4-5 bedroom houses with garages etc.
1244	2	I think the ideal location would be Plevins site at Crookford. A piece meal development there would mean returning semi industrial land back to residential, which is more desirable than developing green field and loosing amenity space.
1244	3	Economically active growing families, with an above average number of children, looking to move to larger dwelling have little choice in the Village other than 'period' properties, so many will move away from the Village which is an economic loss to the local community. It means the more affordable housing stock becomes available but it makes it difficult for large families that wish to stay in the village to stay.
1244	4	As Elkesley is a relatively small community of some approx. 320 homes any sizable development would have a disproportionate effect on the character of the Villages, the most recent sizable development being the 'A1 Homes' off Yew Tree Road several years ago which I think was detrimental to the Village.
1244	5	Many of the houses in Elkesley are in close developments separated by tracts of land and land features which give the impression of amenity and space. I think it would be detrimental and wrong to infill these space for housing that is not really required.....I've noticed several houses have been on the market for a long time.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1244	6	Now that the Elkesley can look forward to having a bridge, I think that when/after the bridge gets built the village will become more appealing.
1245	1	I personally would be against building on parkland and playing fields as children and others need areas for sport and recreation. We should be encouraging active lifestyles and participation in sport especially in Olympic year. The town needs to retain its oasis of green amongst the surrounding areas of concrete. A number of these green areas are also prone to flooding, including King's Park, the Grove Lane playing field and the allotments at the bottom of Strawberry Road.
1245	2	I am resident in Grove Lane. This area is prone to flooding as the nearby beck takes in water that runs into it from the surrounding hilly countryside. There was extensive flooding of properties in the Grove Lane, Blackstope Lane and Trent Street in June 2007. My property flooded twice in June 2007, but it does not need the excessive rainfall experienced then to overwhelm the beck and flood or nearly flood properties in this area. As previously stated, the house flooded twice in 2007 but has almost flooded on four occasions in the last twelve years. I have photographic and camcorder evidence of the garden and outbuildings flooding with the house surrounded by water.
1245	3	Too much water runs into the beck and overwhelms both the beck and the culvert's capacity to cope with that volume. Even steadier amounts of rainfall, far less than experienced in 2007, can lead to flooding. The beck is overwhelmed, water breaches the beck and floods the adjacent Grove Lane playing field and then the nearby properties flood.
1245	4	There was mention that if areas at risk of flooding were selected, then flood alleviation measures would need to be undertaken. The Environment Agency paid a consultancy firm to look into options for flood alleviation in regard to the beck. Their conclusion was that to take adequate measures to alleviate flooding would be too expensive.
1245	5	Therefore to build on Grove playing field which is the first area to flood once the beck is overwhelmed, would be to condemn those new properties and pre-existing neighbouring properties to flooding. It is still going to rain, and the underlying problem of too much water feeding into the beck has not been addressed. Building properties on Grove playing field would increase the amount of concrete ground coverage which means it will be a case of not if but when and how often these properties (proposed and pre-existing) flood. Building there would increase the frequency and severity of flooding. As a council you have a duty and responsibility of overseeing the building proposals but any decisions need to be arrived at responsibly. One of my concerns is that the requirement for adequate flood alleviation measures will be interpreted inadequately. Builders want to realise the maximum profit they can, cutting costs where they can, and there runs the risk of no or woefully inadequate measures being undertaken especially as appropriate measures are likely to be too expensive. Therefore I hope that the council will be rigorous in ensuring that lip service is not paid to any proposed areas that are at risk of flooding. The drains in the area already get overwhelmed with heavy rainfall, building more properties to feed into drains that have difficulty dealing with present demand is another cause for concern. The allotments at the bottom of Strawberry Road have also experienced flooding making that an unsuitable site for building.
1245	6	There are also a number of potential building projects around the Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road area. Again building on areas of grassland thereby increasing the amount of concrete ground coverage is going to add to the amount of rainfall run-off into the beck which ultimately feeds into the culvert on Grove Lane putting the properties close to the culvert at increased risk of flooding.
1245	7	In principle I do not oppose the utilisation of the old Co-op dairy site on Grove Lane and the old Avocet site on Blackstope Lane for employment and business usage, but there are caveats. Firstly, the road access to these sites is such that it precludes the use of large motor vehicles.
1245	8	Secondly, that any business that sets up there should not as part of their operations require a heavy usage of water that would overburden an already struggling drainage system, especially during times of heavy rainfall.
1245	9	Thirdly, that as these sites are in close proximity to domestic properties that any business locating there does not as part of its operations produce toxic and hazardous waste or discharge any toxic or hazardous material into the air.
1245	10	Fourthly. the noise levels produced need to be kept low.
1246	1	The Council's view is that five houses over the timescale of the plan is not unreasonable.
1246	2	The Council's preferred site for development would be the former Bramcote Lorne School but, should this not be available, the Council has no preference between the other proposed sites.
1247	1	We are a Health Walking Group walking the bridleways, footpaths & farm tracks round the Kilton Forest Golf Club and the fields to the East. Our members have authorised me to write on their behalf to oppose any plans to use the area around Kilton [as shown on your map] for development.
1247	2	We currently have a membership of 117, with an average of over 50 attending every Thursday, and between 25 & 30 on Monday evening during the summer. We cater for all levels of walking and welcome referrals from Health Professional and various clinics in the area. I would also point out that there is no charge for these walks and that we organise our own funding. The value of Health Walking is highlighted by a statement issued about a year ago by the NHS [one of the funders of Walking for Health]. They stated that for every pound invested they made a saving of seven pounds. I am sure that the benefits of Health Walking would be endorsed by Bassetlaw District Council Sports Development Department and the Bassetlaw Sport & Physical Activity Partnership.
1247	3	Apart from our own group, Golfers, Bowlers and Footballers, the amenities in the area are also used by countless members of the public for walking dogs and generally taking exercise. Should these proposals proceed, we will be calling a meeting of all users and residents to mount a strong and orchestrated opposition.
1248	1	I write to inform you regarding the site allocation for North & South Wheatley I am in favour of smaller developments scattered throughout the villages rather than large scale.
1248	2	I wish to offer my support of site no 236 with the adjacent field of Whitegates, Top Pasture Lane as a natural enhancement to the village envelope.
1249	1	We would like to make it known that we are in favour of small development to make up the 12 dwellings.
1249	2	Support site 236, coupled with the field adjacent to white gates, for some of the allocation.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Response number	Comment	
1250	1	I wish to express my support of small development in the parishes of North and South Wheatley opposed to large scale sites. In particular I will support site 236 in conjunction with the neighbouring small paddock for a small number of dwellings.
1251	1	At 69 years of age the quality of life on this estate is very important to me. I feel a large housing development would be detrimental to that
1251	2	We have in the past, had problems with yobs coming into the area which were sorted out with the help of John Mann, Alan Rhodes and the local police. We have also had problems with thieves from other areas coming into our area. I myself have had a 125cc motor cycle stolen in spite of 3 locks on the bike and one on the garden gate. The bike was taken to Manton Golf Course and the thieves smashed everything they could on the machine. This happened on 13 November 2009
1251	3	REMOVED
1251	4	REMOVED
1252	1	Three Storey Properties I understand there are aiming the housing proposed. The field is at the top of a hill. All the adjacent properties in Hemmingfield Rise are bungalows which will be overlooked. My bungalow is already adjacent to three two storey houses in westerdale and overlooked by there and several more. Security lights have been a real problem shining into bedrooms.
1252	2	Housing association accommodation quite a number of the houses and bungalows in Hemmingfield Rise are occupied by retired people with health problems. They have worked hard all their lives to buy properties in an area chosen to be quiet. The area will become the entrance to a busy estate and the value of their properties will be reduced. I fully support the building of starter homes for young people but I do not think it is appropriate to have a large number of them right next to retired bungalows. My own niece lives in a housing association property and the area is rife with noisy drinking and drugs problems.
1252	3	Volume of Traffic. Hemmingfield Rise can only be accessed via Hemmingfield Crescent. Because of the two sharp bends in the Crescent visibility is poor and emergency stops and narrow misses are already a frequent occurrence (nearly every week in my experience).
1252	4	There will be a huge increase in traffic with 60 plus new properties. Many of the drivers will be young with a tendency to drive faster than most of the present residents which can only be dangerous. Plans to access the Thievesdale Estate from Hemmingfield Rise were turned down in the 1980s because of this problem.
1252	5	I understand access to the site from Hemmingfield Rise involves destruction of bungalows 20 and 20A and their garages. 20A is next door to me. I am not certain whether it has already owned by the builders William Davies or they just have the option on it. 4 is currently rented. 20 is my bungalow. I have had one letter from William Davies properties with an option to buy I, in order to gain access to the site. I have not responded to this. As you can imagine I find the proposal deeply distressing. I have lived here all my working life as a consultant paediatrician at Bassetlaw Hospital (1984 – 2006). For many years I worked a 1 in 2 rota with no middle grade cover. The rural setting was a great blessing when I was tied so closely to the hospital and frequently called out for emergencies. It is not an exaggeration to say the uncertainty has cast blight on my retirement. I love my home and have no wish to move. Since retiring in 2006 I have needed cataract surgery for glaucoma and am on treatment for heart arrhythmias which increases the risk of a stroke.
1253	1	I can assure the Council that there is a definite need for small developments in the small villages, as we have only built 4 houses in the 52 years I have lived in West Drayton.
1253	2	We have main sewerage now only 10% used.
1253	3	Regular bus services to Ollerton, Tuxford and Retford.
1253	4	A new School at Gamston along with a community hall.
1254	1	Most times of the day, Bracken Lane is turned into a single lane carriageway due to vehicles parking whilst taking/fetching children to school. I have been on the local service bus when it has not been able to proceed due to cars parked. The roads are frequently used by most driving schools who use this area to teach their pupils to drive.
1254	2	I am told that flooding here is now a real problem something that which was unheard of when we moved here and no this is not due to global warming/climate change as we have far wetter seasons and no hosepipe until recently.
1254	3	Already it is extremely difficult and dangerous for vehicles to exit Bracken Lane onto London Road (particularly from Bracken Lane as drivers also have to contend with vehicles leaving Whinney Moor Lane)
1254	4	I don't know much about drainage and waste from houses except that surely if you build over an area which has natural drainage, then you will be flooded. Equally, if you build proposed houses then you have to increase systems to cope.
1254	5	Schools? Bracken Lane school (I am told) is nearly full. Social problems? We all know that these problems increase whenever estates are built.
1255	1	I would be happy with small development in the village over the next 17 years.
1255	2	With off road parking and sizable gardens, of a small low cost nature e.g 2/3 bedrooms
1255	3	Plot 236 and the adjacent paddock would be an appropriate location.
1256	1	We would be happy with 12 houses over the next 17 years that are small scale developments but not large scale developments.
1256	2	We are aware plot 236 has been offered and the adjacent paddock of Whitegates and this would be appropriate.
1257	1	I write to inform you in connection with the above village to tell you that I would agree with 12 houses over the next 17 years.
1257	2	I would prefer them to be 3 bedroomed houses with gardens and ample parking off road with room for trees and bushes etc in keeping with the rural environment.
1257	3	I am not in agreement with some of the sites on offer 239 and 237 it would be more of an estate and not in keeping with the village
1257	4	Plot 236 would be appropriate site and Whitegates paddock.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1257	5	The latter plots would be a more favourable size and therefore I would like my comments to be taken into consideration.
1258	1	I am writing to inform you of my opinion for the above village, I am aware there are some large scale development plots offered however, I do not think these are in keeping with the village.
1258	2	I have lived in the village for 23 years and I am in agreement with 12 house you propose.
1258	3	In particular plot no.236 with the adjacent paddock of white gates.
1259	1	I have lived in Wheatley for about 15 years and would like to offer my support for plot 236 with the paddock at the back of Whitegates on Top Pasture Lane.
1259	2	For some of the 12 houses to be added to North and South Wheatley.
1260	1	Support affordable housing for younger people
1260	2	Prefer the land available at the end of Top Pasture Lane, eg plot 236 and the adjacent land.
1260	3	The housing needs to allow for parking off road access as the access road would be narrow, and to include gardens to encourage families with young children and pets.
1260	4	It would be good for young families to come in, as at the moment the village has for too many pensioners, it would balance us up, and bring in new life to our village school.
1260	5	The number of properties should be limited to no more than 20 properties as the access roads would be heavily over loaded.
1261	1	I would like to inform you I fully support your proposals for a further dozen or so dwellings over the next 17 years between the two villages.
1261	2	However, some of the sites put forward for consideration seem particularly large for the amount of houses required and could I fear potentially spoil the outlook and charm of the village. I have recently had discussions with the owner of the local shop who owns other outbuildings adjacent and understand he would like to utilise these barns to develop for local housing of low cost of which i would be happy to support.
1261	3	I feel a number of smaller developments around the village would be more appropriate and in keeping with the character of the village.
1262	1	Rampton have new houses that have been on sale for three years and no buyers have been found or have been on sale for years.
1262	2	Rampton has an old school room for a village hall with no sound proofing and this has caused controversy in the past BDC environmental health have been called out in past and agreed it was above noise levels that are allowed.
1262	3	It has taken the people of Rampton years to get a playing field and play equipment and now BDC prepare to build on this field. The field is owned by Rampton Parish Council and the people of Rampton.
1262	4	As for Public Transport, the last bus anywhere is in 1830 to Retford. If you have not got Transport even a first to the doctors is a long drawn out job. Young people cannot get anywhere unless their parents take them with the high cost of energy and fuel BDC should be looking more at building in towns. Then the people could make use of public transport and facilities that are offered.
1263	1	The areas have always been, and continued to be, subjected to flooding. There is often standing water in the fields and overflow from them and the ditches frequently spills out onto Grove Road and Bracken Lane.
1263	2	The inevitable increase in traffic would cause problems due to unsuitable narrow lanes, frequently muddy.
1263	3	Planning permission was refused several years ago. The problems then are still on going. So why reconsider? What has changed?
1263	4	I recognise that all householders prefer new homes to be built away from their area and this is so now. However, with me its not just personal wish but a genuine desire that the area near the canal should not be spoilt. Is so much new housing needed in Retford? If so, please choose less beautiful sites.
1264	1	I recognise that all home holders prefer new homes to be built away from their home area -and this is so now - however, with me it is not just a personal wish nut a genuine desire that this lovely area near the canal should not be spoilt.
1264	2	Is so much new housing needed in Retford? If so please choose less beautiful sites.
1265	1	Your plans indicate an intention to develop every open space around Shireoaks.. Shireoaks Common is already over crowded from 7 to 9:30 in the morning and again from 3:15 to 6 in the evening to make it difficult to join the road by car from existing estates and dangerous for pedestrians to cross as there is only one crossing..
1265	2	The school can not cope with a great influx of children who will have to be accompanied by parents, usually in cars adding further to the traffic volume
1265	3	What is more there is insufficient parking near the school and the Monks Way roads are choked with cars making it almost impossible for ambulances, fire engines etc. to gain access in emergencies and there have been such occasions
1265	4	Access to Sheffield via the train or by cars is equally challenging. On the A57 the traffic sometimes is stationary or crawling by Lindrick Dale at it's standing room only on trains with no likelihood of more carriages
1265	5	Bassetlaw hospital is barely coping' I know of instances of people being taken to Doncaster because their were no available beds at Worksop. For a non driver living in Shireoaks that means three buses each way.
1265	6	As for industrial development, there are units on Claylands and off Coach Road that are unused and several have never been used. There are also many 'brown' field sites nearer to town which could do with redeveloping.
1265	7	Finally, because the area around is undeveloped, Shireoaks attracts many walking groups that enjoy the open countryside and the canal walks
1265	8	If we must have housing, we need social housing so that our young people can stay in the village

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1266	1	My views are focused on that there should be no further large developments in Shireoaks.
1266	2	1. Is there a need for building more houses in Shireoaks? A large housing development (off Shireoaks Common) which commenced some years ago is still unfinished and roads are still unadopted.
1266	3	2. The traffic situation in Shireoaks is already a problem especially at peak times with poor parking facilities and long queues of traffic at the railway crossing.
1266	4	3. The village infrastructure cannot support additional developments.
1266	5	4. The local school is oversubscribed.
1266	6	5. Existing play/recreational facilities and local amenities in the village are inadequate.
1266	7	6. The development mentioned at 1 above, is not in keeping with the surrounding area. The Parish Council and many local residents opposed this development and many of their concerns have been realised, i.e. design, appearance, layout, density. More developments of this type will result in losing village identity.
1266	8	7. Serious flooding problems occurred in Shireoaks in 2007 following the development off Shireoaks Common. (Despite strong representations being made by residents and the Parish Council to the District Council and to the Environment Agency that this development (building on a floodplain) , if passed, could create flooding.
1266	9	However, I consider that there is a need for an appropriate development at the Shireoaks Marina Site (References 153 and 587). A small development to compliment the marina and canal surroundings. The development could include appropriate housing, village car parking facilities, recreational/play area and Visitors Centre.
1267	1	1. Much of the area identified forms part of a flood plain.
1267	2	2. Significant flooding occurred in 2007 and some existing properties on Bracken Lane, Grove Coach and Cavendish Roads were affected.
1267	3	3. The existing School on Bracken would be unable to cope with any significant further pupils numbers, as would inevitably occur if the proposed building was to take place.
1267	4	4. Access from Grove Coach Road and Bracken Lane onto London Road can already be difficult, and potentially dangerous at peak/school times, further development on these proposed sites would exacerbate this problem.
1268	1	I am aware of Bassetlaw District Council have proposed a site for new build houses in Gateford, which is right next to woodland, which contains a lot of wildlife. This wildlife includes Bats, which are an endangered species & also Woodpeckers, which are rare these days. The wildlife also use the field that you are planning to build on.
1268	2	The field also has a public bridleway running through it.
1268	3	By building on the proposed site, it will damage the wildlife what we have left. I just want to make you aware of this & I have got RSPB involved on the matter.
1269	1	The area that plans are being put forward to build 230 units, including roads, access and OPEN SPACES!!!! = well open spaces will no longer be there
1269	2	and has anybody looked at, asked about, thought about deeply or even given any consideration to the dangers for children with the roads NO I shouldn't think you have - I mean how dare any children find your road works dangerous - they are one of your biggest earners aren't they ????????????????????
1269	3	Have any of you even considered the amount of noise, the number of people that will be roaming around, the constant mess and filth in the air, in fact you have not thought about any of the inconveniences at all, have you?????????
1269	4	I am disabled and do not need the aggravation and stress of constant noise, mess and strangers roaming near to my home.
1269	5	As far as the elderly and disabled, and the care companies know the homes that should be built there, are bungalows for the elderly and disabled.
1269	6	Has plumbing and waste management been looked into - has the cost of electricity and gas being piped through been looked into - NOT just for those wanting to make money but FOR THOSE who will be left with the mess and the cost of constantly cleaning it up NOW THAT WOULD REALLY BE NEWS !!!!!!!!!!!!!
1270	1	General growth of the community
1270	2	When previous proposals were put forward it was confirmed that drainage was a problem in the area and with all those new houses planned this will cause a lot of residents worry, money and work if we were always having plumbing problems
1270	3	Bracken Lane is already a very difficult place to manoeuvre with the school traffic. The increase of traffic from houses further down the lane would only add to the chaos that ensues at certain parts of the day.
1270	4	Schools, doctors and medical services already overloaded
1270	5	Loss of agricultural land
1270	6	Depreciation of my current home
1270	7	Possible increase of crime
1270	8	I pay a lot of money in council tax to live in a nice peaceful area and I feel this will be threatened should the area expand to the extent you plan.
1271	1	We refer to the above and strongly object to any proposed development on this land. a) The proposal to build what, in effect, would be an ESTATE of houses on the land in question would be inappropriate to a conservation area and would be at odds with the reasons for establishing its status in the first place. The development would not respect the character of the area at all.
1271	2	b) The recent and ongoing Miller Homes development surely provides way in excess of the quota of new houses that the beautiful village of Gringley is expected to provide. The full impact of this large development is yet unknown and it is not clear that the limited infrastructure of the village will be able to cope with this development anyway.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1271	3	c) Over the last decade or more, planning applications on this plot of land have been refused and the reasoning behind these objections has surely not changed but has become more important as more development takes place in the village.
1271	4	d) There is no requirement within the village for any additional public open space / gardens. The playing field, play equipment and tennis court on Finkell Street plus the picnic area near Gringley Wharf provide more than sufficient recreational space for village residents. Such spaces do inevitably encourage youths to congregate and this would be entirely inappropriate in such close proximity to the houses on Low Street.
1271	5	e) Although I have no expertise in this area, I do believe that the access road shown on the map is not of an acceptable width to accommodate the necessary through traffic of vehicles etc and so the land to be given to the community would be greatly reduced and its value would therefore be negligible. The plan does not show the gradient of the land which would also make this open space almost unusable.
1271	6	f) We would be extremely interested to know what historical settlement features are in evidence on the area coloured blue on the plan? This piece of land borders the property called Green Orchard which is in fact the home of the land owner submitting the development plan. Far from having any historical features I would surmise the land is to be left undeveloped simply to benefit his outlook and amenity something he quite obviously does not afford all of those residents who would be adversely affected by the development.
1271	7	g) The proposed development would increase substantially the number of houses on Low Street. The features of Low Street which contributed to it being included within the Conservation Area mean that it would not be able to cope with such a development. It is not possible for two cars to pass each other without one having to reverse and use an existing drive way entrance as a "passing place". Oil tankers, delivery vans and farm vehicles often block the lane completely.
1271	8	h) Low Street would not be able to cope with any surface water runoff from the site notwithstanding any purpose built drainage systems incorporated into the site build. The street frequently floods now during heavy rain as water pours down Cross Hill onto Low Street. The road surface is often being repaired where the flood water lifts the asphalt.
1271	9	i) It is also probably likely that additional houses would overload the current foul sewerage system which is obviously old and emits pungent odours on a frequent basis now.
1271	10	It is likely that the new dwellings will be significantly larger than the existing houses on Low Street and would be out of proportion with their immediate surroundings. Previous planning applications in other areas of the village, within the conservation cartilage, have all resulted in houses being built that are larger than previous buildings and tower over neighbouring houses.. This has had an adverse effect on the character of the village and does not reflect the important historic features of Gringley.
1271	11	In summary we ask you to reject this proposal. The development, if permitted, would by virtue of its form, mass and detailing result in an overbearing, dominating impact on the neighbouring properties. It would significantly alter the form of this part of the village and would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of this part of the conservation area.
1272	1	Owing to the size and nature of the village, I would be in favour of the 12 new houses being provided via a number of smaller sites.
1272	2	I note from the planning for North and South Wheatley in the consultation document that there are a number of possible sites put forward for new housing. Given that we only need to accommodate 12 houses, some of the sites shown seem much too large and could erode the special character of our village, particularly if developed for a significant number of houses.
1272	3	I am therefore particularly supportive of site no 236 and consider this to represent a logical small extension to the existing village boundary.
1272	4	I am also aware that the owner of this site has been in discussions with the adjacent owner of 'Whitegates' with a view to joining their two parcels of land. The two parcels seem to be well contained by existing hedgerows and largely within the existing building form. If brought forward together, I feel these two sites could provide the opportunity to contribute towards meeting the Council's housing requirements for the village with little impact on the character of the village and minimal disturbance to existing residents. If this site is indeed brought forward as an extended part of site no 236, I would be happy to support their combined allocation to accommodate some of the settlement's new housing development.
1273	1	Owing to the size and nature of the village, I would be in favour of the 12 new houses being provided via a number of smaller sites.
1273	2	I note from the planning for North and South Wheatley in the consultation document that there are a number of possible sites put forward for new housing. Given that we only need to accommodate 12 houses, some of the sites shown seem much too large and could erode the special character of our village, particularly if developed for a significant number of houses.
1273	3	I am therefore particularly supportive of site no 236 and consider this to represent a logical small extension to the existing village boundary.
1273	4	I am also aware that the owner of this site has been in discussions with the adjacent owner of 'Whitegates' with a view to joining their two parcels of land. The two parcels seem to be well contained by existing hedgerows and largely within the existing building form. If brought forward together, I feel these two sites could provide the opportunity to contribute towards meeting the Council's housing requirements for the village with little impact on the character of the village and minimal disturbance to existing residents. If this site is indeed brought forward as an extended part of site no 236, I would be happy to support their combined allocation to accommodate some of the settlement's new housing development.
1274	1	SUPPORT 12 NEW HOUSES FOR NORTH AND SOUTH WHEATLEY FOR SITE NO 236 WITH ADJACENT PADDOCK TO THE WEST.
1274	2	I refer to your recent public consultation document relating to the options for the forthcoming 'Site Allocations DPD' and would like my views to be taken into account please when considering future allocations for the villages of North and South Wheatley which I understand are being treated as one settlement for your purposes
1274	3	Owing to the size and nature of the village, I would be in favour of the 12 new houses being provided via a number of smaller sites.
1274	4	I note from the planning for North and South Wheatley in the consultation document that there are a number of possible sites put forward for new housing. Given that we <i>only</i> need to accommodate 12 houses, some of the sites shown seem much too large and could erode the special character of our village, particularly if developed for a significant number of houses
1274	5	I am therefore particularly supportive of site no 236 and consider this to represent a logical small extension to the existing village boundary.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1274	6	I am also aware that the owner of this site has been in discussions with the adjacent owner of 'Whitegates' with a view to joining their two parcels of land. The two parcels seem to be well contained by existing hedgerows and largely within the existing building form.
1274	7	If brought forward together, I feel these two sites could provide the opportunity to contribute towards meeting the Council's housing requirements for the village with little impact on the character of the village and minimal disturbance to existing residents
1275	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1275	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1275	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1275	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1275	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1275	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1276	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1276	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1276	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1276	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1276	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1276	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1276	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1276	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1277	1	I have already raised several times to local, district and county councillors that the Ashes Park estate road network is unable to cope with the current level of traffic from local householders and from people using the estate as a cut through from Carlton. Speed limits are not observed and there is not a time of day when the Ashes Park Avenue junction can be approached without a vehicle waiting at the junction. Installation of a roundabout or traffic lights is needed immediately, there is no way that the current road infrastructure could handle an additional thousand vehicles from the proposed 700 houses.
1277	2	Puddleducks has a waiting list so long, they have been unable to fulfil need during the past three years to my knowledge. Treetops is also full, as is Little Acorns at Shireoaks. No development could happen without provision for early years settings.
1277	3	Gateford Park, Redlands and Prospect all full. Further school provision is required with room to grow if required.
1277	4	Comprehensive school provision also needs to be assessed as I doubt there are spaces available for such an influx of families.
1277	5	Wider implications of shopping facilities, play areas, youth clubs, health centres, elderly care homes and community centres cannot be forgotten.
1277	6	The affect on nature and wildlife would be catastrophic losing critical areas of wildlife habitat. Impact of congestion and pollution from any additional traffic would also have a negative impact on any wildlife that remained.
1277	7	Celtic Point shopping complex is on it's maximum capacity at present, the opening of Asda has proved how incapable the current road structure is of handling any additional through flow of traffic in that area.
1277	8	Teenage provision is at melting point and would only be exacerbated by any development in the area.
1278	1	I believe that this area of town is not suitable for extra development. The roads cannot take the pressure of extra traffic coming in and out of the estate as there are only two exits onto the main road. The junctions (for example -Bigsby Road-Cornwall Road-Park Lane) were not created for a large amount of traffic. They have very poor visibility.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1278	2	Children in the area have no play areas in this part of town and tend to play out on the street. This would increase the danger to them.
1278	3	We already get a large number of heavy goods vehicles due to traffic being diverted down Smeath Lane from Hayton. The traffic near the school on Tiln Lane is already a problem and any further developments would add to this with potentially dangerous consequences.
1278	4	This is an attractive part of town with beautiful open aspects onto countryside. That would be lost forever and would be regretted in years to come. We have the canal and river both in open countryside at this side of the town. Wildlife would suffer or be wiped out in this area.
1278	5	I don't believe that Retford can sustain these extra developments- we have no hospital, little employment, and little or no leisure facilities. I don't believe that more people living here would increase business to local businesses or shops because we have no major shopping facility to bring people in and any extra people moving to live here would be working elsewhere and accessing facilities there.
1278	6	As far as I am aware there is a great percentage of new housing in Retford that has not been purchased. Any new housing development would therefore not be benefitting local people.
1278	7	There are many things that could be done to Retford to improve it and attract employment and businesses- allowing massive housing developments, blighting the look of the town and creating serious traffic problems are not among them.
1279	1	As an Ordsall resident, my comments are bias towards comments on development of this area in particular. I take it as read that the wonderful market town feel of Retford will be protected.
1279	2	Looking at a map of Retford you would think the town was a nicely grouped typical country town, however Retford is poorly divided into two by the main east coast railway line. This has a significant impact upon the town. Consider the road and pedestrian links across the railway, for those living in Ordsall getting into Retford town is difficult.
1279	3	For road users the southernmost roust via the Whitehouse's roundabout requires travelling down the old windy Ordsall village roads and over a narrow bridge; at weekends and evenings these roads become more or less a single lane carriage way due to the amount of on road parking, All Hallows Street becomes a single lane carriage way when there are cricket matches playing and you have to overtake the long row of parked cars around a blind bend on the wrong side of the road. Taking the Northwest route means joining the busy Retford Worksop road, a real bottle neck during peak times. There is also the single lane railway bridge to negotiate.
1279	4	For pedestrian access the bridge near the leisure centre is good but the other 2 routes are less than ideal with, I believe, many feeling insecure and therefore don't like using them. I believe a real opportunity to improve access between Retford and Ordsall was missed when the Bridon works site was approved for development. With these concerns about access is it wise to consider so much development to the south of Ordsall, especially in view of the 2 large developments already committed.
1279	5	I would also note that while getting to Retford town is more difficult that the area map would suggest there is little option as shopping in Ordsall is poor with parking outside the Co-op and post office hazardous.
1279	6	More generally, where areas are to be developed it would be nice to see a similar proportion of protected open space as seen in the rest of Retford.
1280	1	We wish to express our concern regarding the potential site which has been identified and is named site allocation number 4. Whilst we appreciate there maybe a requirement for additional housing in the local Worksop area we feel it would be more prudent to consider existing derelict sites or empty houses within the area before removing/relocating existing amenities.
1280	2	This site enjoys a wealth of wildlife and thrives as an open space for all the local community to enjoy.
1280	3	The golf course has hardened golfers playing regardless of the weather so we don't understand why money would be spent digging up this well established course just to move it half a mile sideways, no doubt the cost of moving this will then be passed onto the members/paying public which will only result in the facilities not being used due to an increase in costs.
1280	4	In 2009 we tried to purchase a small area of ground to the front of our property and the application was rejected by the committee on the basis that "the council wished to maintain this small area of ground for its amenity value and the character it adds to the area". How can the council even consider building on this huge site without acknowledging the impact a large housing estate will have on the immediate area and the outlook and open feel of the area for all the local residents.
1280	5	As such a large housing area has been proposed on the very outskirts of the town has any provision been made for additional amenities (doctors, schools, shops, transport facilities) and safe recreational areas for children/teenagers. As you will appreciate there are very few facilities available for children/teenagers within the immediate area and the existing infrastructure that is available will not be able to cope with the suggested increase in population.
1281	1	Living as I do on Bigsby Road, I cannot see that a development in this area of Retford (that beyond the end of Bigsby Rd round to The Drive) would help congestion in the town centre at peak times or indeed would help the flow of traffic around the existing housing estate.
1281	2	Narrow roads and parked resident's cars already interrupt the flow of moving vehicles, including service buses and dustbin lorries, quite considerably.
1281	3	Similarly, I don't believe that more development of this side of town would be conducive to furthering employment opportunities within Retford. Employment and industry would surely be better located either near the railway or within easy reach of the A638 or A1.
1281	4	I know that there is an issue still to be resolved regarding an existing covenant on land off The Drive and I would urge your law department to look into this.
1281	5	Land behind the Welham / Brixworth estate has been proven to be prone to flooding and whilst you say that problems such as these are easily overcome, I would assume that it would increase the cost of the development of such a site therefore have a knock-on effect upon the sale price of houses to the public.
1281	6	My proposal would be to expand the existing development on the outskirts of Ordsall which would ease traffic congestion coming through town, having quick access to the A1 on Retford's south west side.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1281	7	Alternatively, a mixed housing and industrial development on the north west edge of Retford, further up the North Road (Galway) estate would seem logical in providing employment and housing in an area that could again have easy access to the major route out of town north and the A1.
1281	8	A development here would maybe encourage the building of a new primary school that could take children from Hallcroft who are currently transported up to Carr Hill.
1281	9	Further to this, a short walk across the North Road would enable workers quick access to existing industrial units off Randall Way.
1282	1	All the fields that are included flood on a regular basis. This seems to be not believed by some planners that I have spoken to on the phone. As I run past these fields most days and see the condition that they are in means that I am either short sighted or someone has changed the definition of wet! The fields flood because of the Grove hills and if buildings are placed on these fields then the water must go somewhere and that will probably be into existing homes. It already happens on a regular basis.
1282	2	The infer structure will simply not be able to cope with increasing number of houses. Grove Coach Road is already a nightmare, roads are very narrow and the schools are full.
1282	3	Finally the fields in question were subject to planning proposals in the mid 1990's and this was turned down due to massive corruption concerns, arrests and a London judge being employed to look into the matter. Nothing has changed since the report 15 years ago so where is the justification in granting permission now. I would urgently request confirmation of this e mail. Myself and my wife have both been given incorrect information over the set applications. The first person in planning said to my wife in November 2011 that the only applications were opposite the Whitehouse's public house and no where else. I was informed by a lady in December 2011 in planning that the only field that was being considered was at the bottom of Grove Coach Road!! Both incorrect.
1283	1	Access to your plan clearly shows for all traffic to leave by way of Hemmingfield Rise then on to Hemmingfield Crescent. We have a lot of congestion on Hemmingfield Crescent especially at weekends. Traffic cannot get up this small hill in the winter. This is not a bus route so is the last to get gritted.
1283	2	A more direct route to a main road is via Winter Grove/Ambleside Grange onto Carlton Road. If development of this site went ahead would consideration be given to the design of the site so half the traffic left via Ambleside and half via Hemmingfield e.g. no through roads on site.
1283	3	This land is adjacent to bungalows will consideration be given a shortage of this type in Worksop.
1284	1	The community benefits offered by the proposed development on this site have been promoted over the last few years and have resulted from consultation and discussions with bodies within Misterton who have aspirations to see various facilities within the village enhanced
1284	2	Since the Core Strategy Examination in 2011, the landowner of the site was approached by Misterton United Junior Football Club which has expanded over the last 2 years and now has 4 teams. The Club is looking for a permanent location as the current site is time-limited. After a meeting between the landowner and the Club committee in November 2011, it is now proposed that as part of the overall development, the part of the site to the east of Misterton Primary and Nursery School (the School) be given over to the Football Club which the delivery of the dwellings will be able to fund. Whilst it had been proposed that that land could be used for employment, there has been a preference shown by the community for a permanent location for the Football Club.
1284	3	It is further proposed that other sports facilities could be located on that part of the site; multi-disciplinary usage (for example, the provision of a MUGA) would make it potentially easier to access grant-assistance for facilities on the site as the site is to be gifted.
1284	4	A further meeting has taken place with Dr. A. J. Brownson of the Misterton Surgery, and he has re-written a letter of support for the development dated 25 January 2012 which letter is attached to this submission.
1284	5	A meeting was held on 26 January 2012 with Mrs. Jane Cappleman-Jackson, head of the School. Whilst meetings had taken place with David Herrett, her predecessor, it was an opportunity to discuss the potential development and to establish how, if anything, the situation had altered at the School and what requirements it had for any funding assistance. Mrs Cappleman-Jackson was supportive of the proposals and could see the benefits the development could offer Misterton particularly the close proximity of the School, doctor's surgery and pharmacy, community hall, Football Club and housing; indeed, many of the members of the teams within the Football Club are pupils at the School.
1284	6	Further, Mgrs. Cappleman-Jackson confirmed that the School does have spare capacity to absorb new pupils.
1284	7	The requirements of the School relate mainly to the fabric of the building, for example, whilst a new boiler has been installed, much warm air is escaping through rotting and poorly fitting windows. The further requirements of the School are to be discussed at the next governor's meeting and these will then be considered as part of the overall relationship to the proposed housing to ascertain how benefits could be passed to the School. What was mentioned, was how the swimming pool could be utilised for Misterton as a whole during evenings, weekends and holidays as it is currently only available during school hours and in so doing strengthen the interaction of sports facilities between the School and the community. The benefits of the proposed housing will be social, functional and financial to the wider community within Misterton.
1284	8	In conclusion, there will be provision of up to 100 high quality dwellings on 10 acres within the overall development which will further comprise: Open space, both formal through the provision of football and other sports facilities and informal through landscaping. Relocation of the doctor's surgery and pharmacy. Community Hall.
1285	1	I am in support of site 87 because of what is being offered to the community. The lans to be used for employment is necessary as the site of the former Newell Dunford works has been lost for employment purpose. New employment opportunities for Misterton can only be positive.
1285	2	The area to be used for green infrastructure appears to offer several potential uses of which provision of a community centre is important given that Misterton has no such facility currently
1285	3	From the medical centre perspective, a relocation to the proposed site would enable enhanced facilities to be offered and I would view such a move positive.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1285	4	The proposal is also to provide up to 150 high quality houses which Misterton is in need of. It is likely that the site will be developed in the future anyway and so perhaps the community should seize the opportunity to benefit from the development now rather than not benefit in the future.
1286	1	Such a development would seriously detract from the existing housing on Brixworth Way & Welham Grove by blocking the countryside views these houses currently enjoy. That would adversely affect the marketplace £worth of these houses.
1286	2	I also question the effect such a development will have on the wildlife that inhabit the wild grassland under proposal
1286	3	I further question that the area of Site #69 is not needed for a natural water meadow or/ flood alleviation area, being as it is so close to the canal.
1286	4	I further question the detrimental effect such a development would have on the pleasure currently afforded water users (wildlife, boats & fishing) by enclosing the canal on both banks for the distance proposed
1287	1	There are already numerous houses for sale or rent.
1287	2	Specifically round Worksop currently, I see properties which appear empty or derelict, why can't arrangements be made to renovate these and make existing residential areas more appealing and affordable?
1287	3	If however, the people who are expected to occupy these houses aren't in Bassetlaw at present, where are they coming from and will they be bringing their jobs with them? If not and assuming that each household will have at least one person who is expected to work, where are these 6000 jobs? I can't see that number of vacancies round here at the moment, nor in the foreseeable future from what we are lead to understand about the state of the economy. This means that they will be competing with those Bassetlaw people who are already unemployed. In the current economic climate, with the exorbitant fuel costs and public transport fares, commuting to the larger towns and cities becomes less of an attractive or affordable proposition.
1287	4	What will be the impact on the infrastructure within the overall community? If say, 75% of the new households have children, say, 2 per family and the others are couples, this amounts to 21,000 people. They will all need access to healthcare, from a service which is under severe pressure as it is. Working on the above assumption, will school places be available for a further 9000 children? There will also be implications for policing and for example, how council services and Jobcentre services are available to meet the needs of these extra people. Will Local and Central Government provide more funding to cover this? This is all at a time of drastic cuts in the public sector.
1287	5	I think it paramount that old industrial sites are utilised as far as possible for this purpose. Given the decline over recent years, surely there must be suitable land.
1287	6	REMOVED
1288	1	<p>Having been resident at my current address for just over two years I could not fail to notice the fact that the fields in question are waterlogged during the winter months and during rainy weather. The field at Bracken Lane school is unusable for this very reason during these periods. Having spoken to residents who were in their properties during 2007 I have ascertained that the properties on my side of Rutland Road had their gardens flooded and the garages also in some cases. It was only by good fortune that this occurred when people were at home, rather than at work, and they were able to take action by coming together to bale out garages before any substantial damage was caused.</p> <p>I understand also that, during 2007 when much of the county experienced problems with flooding, considerable areas of the fields in question and the lane serving Blacks Farm were under water. There have been drainage problems in the area for many years now as I understand it since the previous developments in the area. Water comes down the incline in the land from the woods at the far end of the lane continuing from Grove Coach Road and settles in the fields at the bottom of the incline where the proposed development is sited.</p> <p>I have great concerns in view of this that, should further development take place, any flooding would be exacerbated and some individuals may actually experience flooding inside their properties</p>
1288	2	A side issue to this is the fact that hedgerows would be uprooted which currently support a large variety of flora and fauna and numerous species of birds.
1288	3	As the lane from the bottom of Bracken Lane out to Little Gringley is very twisting and narrow, and also in a poor state of repair, it seems logical that most of the traffic generated from any new homes would access the road network via Bracken Lane and Grove Coach Road onto London Road. This can be particularly difficult at times if turning right towards the town centre, as most traffic does. It is so problematic at times that the only way to achieve this is to turn left and then use the mini roundabout at Whitehouse's to come back towards Retford. This is not without its dangers as traffic approaching the roundabout from Ordsall is not expecting this type of manoeuvre and I have seen quite a few near misses and been involved in one myself.
1289	1	My objections are based largely around years of observation. The infra structure around these sites has not seen development over the years and with councils freezing council taxes I struggle to envisage how funds would be available to make the necessary adaptations to support both the period of any building and the subsequent changes necessary should houses be inhabited or industrial units occupied. The obvious need for effective sanitation and the construction involved to effect this puts a massive strain on any area both in terms of physical burden and the potential disruption to an already established residential. The adjacent properties have been built around 26 - 31 years ago

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1289	2	The road leading to the A1 - is a narrow poorly surfaced road which is not treated in times of priority gritting. To consider any development road widening would be essential with the addition of street lighting and footpaths along with the speed limit of 30 mph extending from its current starting point. These costs would be immense as planned costs to say nothing of the potential unknown costs as such projects invariably hit unexpected hiccups.
1289	3	Another observation that may be worth considering is the possibility that the ground itself may not be as substantial as expected. When the earthquake of 28th February 2008 with the epicentre of Middle Risen, Links took place it was felt in our property, subsequently cracks appeared on the South side of our property albeit fine but nevertheless in existence
1289	4	Retford is a rural market town. To site such significant developments at the very edge of its border would seem to take away its identity. To imagine that the busy A1 would pass so close to the developments would change the character of this area entirely.
1289	5	This town has limited policing. A recent announcement in the Retford Times announced the presence of an extra Community Support Officer. With the growth of such positions in the county I have severe concerns as a resident and a parent of children aged 13 and 11. I know that these Officers do not have the powers of a Constable and while I commend the work they do I know that these appointments do not provide a suitable protection for the public. In increasing the number of properties in the town it would be essential that policing ratios were addressed accordingly. This town has already lost its magistrates court. I am not filled with hope that funding would be offered to support the need for effective public protection
1289	6	The proposed residential development would naturally mean that school places would be affected. I am both a part time teacher in a Retford school and a governor in another. I am very aware how funding for such developments has rapidly reduced in recent years and suggest that any promises about new buildings would be empty despite the misleading article in the local press in recent months about new builds.
1289	7	To impose such a development upon an area which has been neglected in terms of infrastructure development and threatens the character of the rural market town taking away good arable land would be extreme and showing a lack of foresight
1290	1	I recognise from previous work done on the Core Strategy that no further development is planned in Misterton and that there are similarly no plans for development in West Stockwith
1290	2	I acknowledge that the sites designated on the site allocations map are the aspirations of landowners and that, in Misterton, there are differences of opinion on how much, if any, further development there should be. The Parish Council has resolved to respond to this consultation - and its views will be publicly available - but I am aware that those views are not shared by a significant number of residents
1290	3	previous surveys have shown a need for affordable housing in Misterton. The Parish Council has commissioned a further study and the results need to be taken into account in any future developments in the village
1290	4	Misterton has had negligible community benefit from the hundreds of dwellings built over the last decade, and any further development needs to be accompanied by tangible benefits
1290	5	I will comment further on particular, developable sites (orange in the site allocations map):88/89 some areas of low-lying land (flood risk) and issues of access onto Gringley Road, where there are problems of fast (in excess of the speed limit) downhill traffic
1290	6	91 similar problems of access into Gringley Road
1290	7	93 low-lying (flood risk) and the southern part of this site is an area of mature landscape alongside the Chesterfield Canal. A previous planning application had identified this area for development as a marina.
1290	8	Development of the northern part of this site 93 would give access problems onto the High Street
1290	9	201 this site slopes downhill south to north towards the Chesterfield Canal, so at the lower (northern) the points made above regarding flood risks apply
1290	10	481 this would introduce housing in a hitherto undeveloped (greenfield) area and, in my view, should not be encouraged
1290	11	87 this site has met with a particularly negative reaction from the Parish Council. An earlier proposal for development on this site had included industrial development. Though this has not been defined, there seems to have been an assumption that this means warehouses. There is a need for employment in Misterton and if 'industrial development' were low level buildings based on high-tech industries, taking advantage of Misterton's relatively good, and hopefully improving, broadband connections, this may allay some residents' concerns.
1290	12	The developer has addressed the Parish Council in the past and offered community benefits on the site - these were turned down, but if such benefits are still 'on the table', and can also be of benefit to the adjacent primary school, I think this option should not be dismissed out of hand but must be taken in the round if/when this site comes forward for development
1290	13	86/202 these sites are Council owned and could be locations to include affordable housing.
1291	1	The Environment Agency "What's in your backyard?" map clearly indicates that the plot is within the floodable area
1291	2	This plot is the only green wedge of land to the east of the town
1291	3	The plot is home to a variety of flora and fauna, including barn owls and other birds of prey.
1292	1	As a prelude to that consultation I would advise you that the Tickhill Board has concerns with the following sites with respect to surface water disposal Willerby's Drain 358, 359, 205 &206
1292	2	Harworth Sewage Dike (EA main river) 193,204, 180,232
1292	3	Site 182 is outside of the Board's area but depending on how surface water is managed surface water discharge into the Board's area may occur.
1292	4	Sites 190 & 188 have been discussed at previous meetings and provided the surface water discharges are attenuated as agreed.
1292	5	Sites 187 & 191. Surface water from both these sites may eventually discharge into the above Board
1292	6	Employment Sites H4 & H6 Both these sites are within the above Board.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1292	7	The Isle of Axholme & North Notts WLMB also covers the following villages Everton, Misson, Gringley, parts of Misterton, Clayworth, Clarborough, Hayton and West Stockwith.
1293	1	512 and 37 are mainly for agricultural use and provide a clear definition between the urban and rural aspects of Retford – between the well populated section of Tiln Lane and the rural Bolham area;
1293	2	In addition, site 37 is not suitable for any development purpose as it is adjacent to a dangerous bend on a very busy road (national speed limit) with large goods vehicles (avoiding the low bridge at Clarborough) ‘thundering’ past at all times of the day. Any development in this parcel of land would require significant road safety improvements making it of limited commercial viability
1293	3	Sites 6, 7, 46, 69 and 309 are mainly agricultural interspersed with public footpaths providing beautiful scenic and stunning views of open countryside and the canal. Like 512 and 37, they provide a clear definition between the urban town and rural countryside between Retford and Clarborough
1293	4	The volume of houses between all these sites exceeds the total Retford requirement of 577 houses by 700
1293	5	All the above areas will require significant investment in utility services and sites 512 and 37 are not supplied by any mains sewage or gas
1293	6	All the above sites will lie within the catchment area of the Carr-Hill Primary school (site 1/34) which we understand is already oversubscribed and will require significant capital and revenue investment – assuming the building extensions are a) permissible (designated Open Space) and b) possible as it appears land-locked anyway
1293	7	There are no other facilities such as shops, community centres etc. within the area of Tiln Lane
1293	8	In summary, therefore, we believe that these sites are neither suitable nor viable for housing or mixed use and should be re-designated as Open spaces for the benefit of both local people and visitors to the area. However, we do accept the need for the town to accommodate increasing demand over the next few years and would suggest the following:
1293	9	As a principle. The use of ‘Brownfield’ sites should be used before use of current un-built/agricultural sites; specifically, those in either current mixed use or residential areas that have areas, not designated as Open Space within which additional housing/mixed use can be further developed. For example, the following sites: a. 10; b. 40 and 52; c. 41 and 364; d. 359 and R2; e. 51 and R7; f. 342 The above sites, if selected, provide a total of 1131 houses - 554 more than required. Finally, are the current ‘committed housing’ sites numbers of houses included or excluded in the overall plan of requirements for Retford over the period of the plan? If the latter, what is the number of houses ‘approved’ within this commitment and do they equal or exceed the requirement of 577 for Retford. If so, then why look for additional potential sites?
1294	1	Isobel Collins informs me tat she would like to raise her concerns regarding the plan to build 900 houses near to the Community Centre in Ordsall. Isobel Collins believes that there are too many houses already and too few recreation areas.
1295	1	Any increase in population obviously will lead to an increased workload for EMAS and other emergency & health services. The actual amount will depend on the final plans and numbers. This will, particularly in a rural setting, have an impact on our ability to meet the 8 minute (Category A8) response target for life-threatening conditions.
1295	2	The PCT or then CCG commissioners would have to lead the health community-wide review to assess how health and emergency needs are planned and funded.
1295	3	The impact and need for good road infrastructure would have to be considered, as an 8 minute response is a challenge in mainly rural settings due to the geography.
1295	4	EMAS is currently looking at its estates and workforce plans in order to meet current and estimated future activity levels. The estates strategy in particular has longer lead-in times and we would be very interested to be involved as soon as the final development locations are agreed, to discuss possible sites for an ambulance station or shared facilities with other health or emergency services in the Bassetlaw area. Also the identification of suitable stand-by points.
1295	5	In the wider view of health provision of unplanned care we are also happy to explore different models of delivery of unplanned care, from the 999 response to urgent care, clinical telephone advice services to primary care-based emergency staff.
1295	6	In the main online Bassetlaw option feedback section: Q 121, 122 & 123: As a service we have done some work with the Gypsy and Traveller communities, which shows that their access to health care and their health outcomes can be very poor. From the awareness I have had through that work, I believe you should consult with those communities to ensure the sites are relevant and acceptable for the different groups, and then once a shortlist of acceptable sites is agreed consult locally which fit best into the plan. Then the access to local health and other services needs to be designed and funded in an accessible way.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1296	1	My main concern is the addition of traffic to the already congested and, at the beginning and end of the school day, fairly dangerous Bracken Lane. I walk my child to school, parked cars along Bracken Lane and Rose Avenue make crossing the roads to school at times challenging. In winter time when the unsalted road often resembles an ice rink the manoeuvre is quite dangerous. Only last summer a pupil at the school was hit by a car whilst crossing the road
1296	2	Bracken lane School is, I understand full, where will families with children take them to school? Again adding to traffic congestion.
1296	3	Exiting Bracken lane onto London Road is also extremely difficult most of the time, and Grove Coach road suffers with queuing traffic at busy times. The addition to more residential traffic can in my opinion only make these situations worse and accidents for pedestrians and drivers more likely.
1296	4	As a regular dog walker I also use the lanes linking Bracken Lane and Grove Coach road. A lot of the lane is single track with poor visibility of vehicles
1296	5	Most of the fields in this area particularly in winter and after heavy rainfall are water logged. Indeed the summer sports day at Bracken Lane School often depends on suitability of the field due to flooding. If more housing is built I fear the flood water will move, putting existing properties more at risk.
1296	6	Finally I understand that the current infrastructure is inadequate to cope with any future housing developments, which is a great concern to me as a local resident
1297	1	Regarding Bassetlaw District Council's current plans to build further housing in Worksop, I am totally opposed to any new housing or other development on existing green space around the town. This town and the countryside around it cannot sustain further development. Greenfield space should be retained for agriculture, wildlife and amenity.
1298	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1298	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1298	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1298	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1298	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1298	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1298	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1298	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1298	9	Up to opposite Randall Way junction. Accessible and sensible 'rounding off'.
1298	10	Limited extension along Tiln Lane, very accessible, good links to town centre.
1298	11	Ready made for development! Excellent access.
1298	12	Former/existing garage depot? More suited to housing.
1298	13	Industrial site located in (now) residential area. Better to have housing on here (amenity, vehicles etc.).
1298	14	Excellent access to highway network, would not be visually intrusive.
1299	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1299	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1299	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1299	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1299	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1299	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1299	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1299	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1299	9	Up to opposite Randall Way junction. Accessible and sensible 'rounding off'.
1299	10	Limited extension along Tiln Lane, very accessible, good links to town centre.
1299	11	Ready made for development! Excellent access.
1299	12	Former/existing garage depot? More suited to housing.
1299	13	Industrial site located in (now) residential area. Better to have housing on here (amenity, vehicles etc.).
1299	14	Excellent access to highway network, would not be visually intrusive.
1300	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1300	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1300	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1300	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1300	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1300	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1300	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1300	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1300	9	Up to opposite Randall Way junction. Accessible and sensible 'rounding off'.
1300	10	Limited extension along Tiln Lane, very accessible, good links to town centre.
1300	11	Ready made for development! Excellent access.
1300	12	Former/existing garage depot? More suited to housing.
1300	13	Industrial site located in (now) residential area. Better to have housing on here (amenity, vehicles etc.).
1300	14	Excellent access to highway network, would not be visually intrusive.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1301	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1301	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1301	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1301	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1301	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1301	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1301	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1301	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1301	9	Up to opposite Randall Way junction. Accessible and sensible 'rounding off'.
1301	10	Limited extension along Tiln Lane, very accessible, good links to town centre.
1301	11	Ready made for development! Excellent access.
1301	12	Former/existing garage depot? More suited to housing.
1301	13	Industrial site located in (now) residential area. Better to have housing on here (amenity, vehicles etc.).
1301	14	Excellent access to highway network, would not be visually intrusive.
1302	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1302	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1302	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1302	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1302	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1302	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1302	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1302	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1303	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1303	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1303	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1303	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1303	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1303	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1303	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1303	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1304	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1304	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1304	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1304	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1304	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1305	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1305	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1305	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1305	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1305	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1305	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1305	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1305	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1306	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1306	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1306	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1306	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1306	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1306	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1306	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1306	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1307	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1307	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1307	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1307	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1307	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1307	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1307	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1307	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1308	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1308	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1308	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1308	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1308	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1308	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1308	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1308	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1309	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1309	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1309	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1309	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1309	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1309	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1309	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1309	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1310	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1310	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1310	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1310	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1310	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1310	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1310	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1310	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1311	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1311	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1311	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1311	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1311	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1311	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1311	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1311	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1312	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1312	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1312	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1312	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1312	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1312	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1312	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1312	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1313	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1313	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1313	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1313	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1313	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1313	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1313	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1313	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1314	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1314	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1314	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1314	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1314	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1314	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1314	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1314	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1315	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1315	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1315	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1315	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1315	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1315	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1315	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1315	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1316	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1316	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1316	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1316	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1316	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1316	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1316	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1316	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1317	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1317	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1317	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1317	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1317	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1317	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1317	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1317	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1318	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1318	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1318	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1318	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1318	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1318	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1318	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1318	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1319	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1319	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1319	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1319	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1319	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1319	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1319	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1319	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1320	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1320	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1320	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1320	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1320	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1320	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1320	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1320	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1321	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1321	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1321	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1321	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1321	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1321	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1321	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1321	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1322	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1322	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1322	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1322	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1322	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1322	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1322	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1322	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1323	1	The development of this would increase traffic flow through Ordsall which is already congested with cars parked on the High Street.
1323	2	The village has a single width bridge limited access, this would increase the traffic flow and is not suitable for increased traffic flow.
1323	3	The Primary School on West Hill Way causes traffic flow difficulties at certain times during the day, and increased housing would only add more to the problem.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1323	4	Ordsall at the moment is quiet a rural setting, and would be nice to be kept so, the road leading from and to AI is very narrow and winding and I feel would increase the risk of accidents on this stretch of road.
1323	5	The bridle path which crosses the land in question is used by children dog walkers elderly and runners, increase in housing would add to disruption.
1323	6	The road into the proposed site runs directly over the bridle footpath so this will increase chance of accidents to walkers. Also I understand it is not allowed to drive a car over existing footpaths.
1323	7	The proposed site is home to lots of wildlife some protected species.
1323	8	The proposed site stands in water for most of the year due to poor drainage, it has a dyke which runs the length of the site, but this now is so overgrown that no water runs through, this would have to be filled in so resulting in poor drainage on the site and also lead subsidence in the future. For reasons stated above it is considered that the proposed site south of Ordsall is unsuitable for large scale housing or mixed use development.
1324	1	Keep Ordsall rural. I feel more funds need to be ploughed into the town centre of Retford to attract more business to invest in the town.
1324	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1324	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1324	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1324	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1324	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1324	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1324	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1325	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1325	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1325	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1325	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1325	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1326	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1326	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1326	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1326	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1326	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1326	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1326	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1326	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1327	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1327	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1327	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1327	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1327	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1327	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1327	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1327	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1328	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1328	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1328	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1328	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1328	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1328	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1328	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1328	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1329	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1329	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1329	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1329	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1329	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1329	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1329	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1329	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1330	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1330	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1330	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1330	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1330	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1330	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1330	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1330	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1331	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1331	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1331	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1331	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1331	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1331	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1331	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1331	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1332	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1332	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1332	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1332	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1332	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1332	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1332	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1332	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1333	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1333	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1333	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1333	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1333	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1333	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1333	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1333	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1334	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1334	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1334	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1334	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1334	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1334	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1334	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1334	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1335	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1335	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1335	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1335	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1335	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1335	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1335	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1335	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1336	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1336	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1336	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1336	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1336	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1336	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1336	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1336	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1337	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1337	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1337	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1337	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1337	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1337	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1337	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1337	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1338	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1338	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1338	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1338	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1338	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1338	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1338	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1338	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1339	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1339	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1339	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1339	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1339	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1339	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1339	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1339	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1340	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1340	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1340	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1340	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1340	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1340	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1340	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1340	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1341	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1341	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1341	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1341	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1341	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1341	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1341	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1341	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1342	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1342	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1342	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1342	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1342	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1342	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1342	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1342	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1343	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1343	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1343	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1343	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1343	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1343	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1343	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1343	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1344	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1344	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1344	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1344	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1344	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1344	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1344	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1344	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1345	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1345	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1345	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1345	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1345	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1345	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1345	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1345	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1346	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1346	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1346	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1346	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1346	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1346	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1346	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1346	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1347	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1347	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1347	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1347	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1347	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1347	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1347	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1347	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1348	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1348	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1348	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1348	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1348	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1348	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1348	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1348	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1349	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1349	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1349	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times
1349	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1349	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1349	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1349	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1349	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1350	1	I/we have significant concerns about the allocation of land to the south of Ordsall for future housing and mixed use development (site numbers 1, 40, 41, 52, 259 and 364) for the following reasons: Transport Links. In order to get from these sites into Retford Town Centre residents are likely to travel along High Street (which is predominantly single width due to existing on-street parking) and then turn onto Goosemoor Lane. The bridge on Goosemoor Lane is narrow and has poor pedestrian facilities. This bridge is not suitable to accommodate a significant number of additional vehicles (or pedestrians) generated by additional housing sites. Additionally, due to the narrow width of the bridge, vehicles passing in opposite directions often have to stop as there is insufficient room to pass. Additional housing would lead to additional congestion on and near to the bridge.
1350	2	The development of these sites is likely to result in additional traffic movements through Eaton village (to get to the A638). This village has a single width bridge, limited pedestrian facilities and the road running through the village is inappropriate for significantly increased traffic flows.
1350	3	Access to the north (onto the A620) is along West Hill Road/Ordsall Road and passes Ordsall Primary School. At the beginning and end of the school day a significant amount of on-street parking occurs, resulting in single-file traffic on West Hill Road. Additional housing would lead to greater congestion at peak times

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1350	4	Access from the proposal sites to the south (to the A1) is along a winding rural road which does not get gritted by Nottinghamshire County Council. For the reasons stated above, the infrastructure in the locality is not suitable for significantly more cars associated with large-scale residential development, or large commercial vehicles associated with mixed uses.
1350	5	Visual Impact. Retford currently has a reputation as a small market town and this attracts visitors to the area. The principal route into the town from the south is along London Road (the A638). Sites 1, 52 and 40 are particularly visible from London Road as they are elevated. New housing development on these sites will detrimentally affect the character of this side of Retford (especially from London Road) and will have the appearance of 'sprawl' into the open countryside.
1350	6	Wildlife. The proposed sites are the home to a wide selection of wildlife -including some endangered species. The list includes: Skylarks -breed, feed and live on the sites. NB The skylark population has decreased by approximately 50%. The RSPB are very interested in these sites. Lapwings. Finches. Tits. Barn Owl (flight path). Bats -the Bat Conservation Society are very interested in this habitat. Foxes. Hawks. Kestrels. Heron. Stork (occasional visitor). Hedgehogs. Hundreds of bees and a wide selection of butterflies, insects and other birds.
1350	7	Local Use. The sites are well used by walkers, runners, children and young people playing, dog walkers, the elderly, triathlete; etc. Additionally, people visit from outside the area to enjoy the panoramic views. There are also designated public footpaths across the sites.
1350	8	Conclusion. For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal sites located to the south of Ordsall are unsuitable for large-scale housing or mixed use development and that more appropriate and accessible sites are located elsewhere in Retford.
1351	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1351	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1351	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1351	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1351	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1351	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1352	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1352	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1352	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1352	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1352	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1352	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1353	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1353	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1353	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1353	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1353	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1353	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1354	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1354	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1354	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1354	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1354	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1354	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1355	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1355	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1355	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1355	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1355	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1355	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1356	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1356	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1356	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1356	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1356	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1356	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1357	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1357	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1357	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1357	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1357	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1357	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1358	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1358	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1358	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1358	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1358	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1358	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1359	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1359	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1359	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1359	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1359	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1359	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1360	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1360	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1360	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1360	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1360	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1360	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1361	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1361	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1361	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1361	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1361	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1361	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1362	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1362	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1362	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1362	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1362	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1362	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1363	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1363	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1363	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1363	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1363	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1363	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1364	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1364	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1364	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1364	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1364	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1364	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1365	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1365	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1365	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1365	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1365	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1365	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1366	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1366	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1366	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1366	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1366	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1366	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1367	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1367	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1367	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1367	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1367	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1367	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1368	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1368	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1368	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1368	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1368	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1368	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1369	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1369	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1369	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1369	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1369	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1369	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1370	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1370	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1370	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1370	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1370	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1370	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1371	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1371	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1371	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1371	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1371	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1371	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1372	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1372	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1372	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1372	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1372	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1372	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1373	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1373	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1373	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1373	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1373	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1373	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1374	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1374	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1374	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1374	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1374	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1374	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1375	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1375	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1375	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1375	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1375	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1375	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1376	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1376	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1376	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1376	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1376	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1376	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1377	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1377	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1377	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1377	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1377	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1377	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1378	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1378	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1378	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1378	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1378	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1378	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1379	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1379	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1379	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1379	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1379	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1379	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1380	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1380	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1380	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1380	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1380	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1380	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1381	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1381	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1381	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1381	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1381	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1381	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1382	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1382	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1382	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1382	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1382	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1382	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1383	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1383	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1383	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1383	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1383	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1383	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1384	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1384	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1384	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1384	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1384	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1384	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1385	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1385	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1385	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1385	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1385	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1385	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1386	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1386	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1386	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1386	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1386	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1386	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1387	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1387	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1387	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1387	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1387	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1387	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1388	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1388	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1388	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1388	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1388	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1388	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1389	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1389	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1389	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1389	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1389	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1389	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1390	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1390	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1390	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1390	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1390	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1390	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1391	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1391	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1391	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1391	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1391	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1391	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1392	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1392	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1392	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1392	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1392	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1392	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1393	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1393	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1393	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1393	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1393	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1393	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1394	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1394	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1394	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1394	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1394	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1394	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1395	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1395	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1395	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1395	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1395	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1395	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1396	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1396	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1396	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1396	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1396	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1396	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1397	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1397	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1397	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1397	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1397	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1397	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1398	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1398	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1398	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1398	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1398	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1398	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1399	1	It is important that the relative merits of sites are assessed against the full range of sustainability criteria. PPS3 advises that in identifying sites for housing development local planning authorities should identify locations offering good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure and take into account issues including physical access, land contamination, flood risk, impacts on natural resources, biodiversity and landownership issues. Sites should also be assessed for their suitability, availability and achievability. The two stage approach to site screening appears to imply that sites passing the stage 1 assessment are equally suitable for development and that decisions on sites for inclusion in the Preferred Options will be made solely on sites' performance against the 9 stage 2 assessment criteria. The stage 2 assessment criteria do not include important assessments undertaken at stage 1 relating to access to services and facilities, site availability and achievability and, for employment sites, attractiveness to the market.
1399	2	Criterion 1 relates to the level of community support for a proposal. Whilst the views of the local community are an important consideration, there is concern that the assessment of the level of community support is subjective overly. The methodology refers to "strong" community support or "some" community support without giving clear guidance how this will be measured. Local opposition should not rule out sites that offer the most appropriate development solution in planning terms. Care needs to be taken about how the level of community support is used to inform decisions on site allocations through the Preferred Options document. Consideration of the level of community support cannot be assessed on an individual site by site basis. The Council needs to undertake proper engagement with the local community on the options available looking at the various development opportunities and their relative merits, recognising the need to identify new employment and housing sites to meet established Core Strategy requirements.
1399	3	The assessment of sites for inclusion in the Preferred Options Consultation should be undertaken based on a comparative assessment of sites against both the Phase 1 SHLAA/ELCS criteria and the 9 Stage 2 criteria. This will provide a robust assessment of the most sustainable development options to meet the Core Strategy's requirements for further housing and employment land provision over the period to 2028. The land at Shireoaks Common was assessed under the SHLAA as suitable, achievable and potentially available for development (SHLAA ref 195).
1399	4	It can be confirmed that Hallam Land Management Limited (HLM) is promoting the site on behalf of the landowners and is committed to bringing the site forward at the earliest opportunity. The site is therefore available.
1399	5	The ELCS assessed the site as a good quality employment site opportunity (site ref W8). The site was the highest ranked potential site alongside land south of Manton Wood and land east of the A57/A60 junction. Compared with land to the east of the A57 junction, the study concluded that the land at Shireoaks Common was the better site due to its more even topography, prominence on the A57 and relationship to the urban area of Shireoaks. The study also acknowledged ownership constraints affecting the release of the Gateford Common site and noted that the need to develop land at Shireoaks Common would be more pressing should these ownership issues continue to stall progress.
1399	6	The Promotional Document prepared in support of this response sets out an appraisal of the land at Shireoaks Common and demonstrates that it represents one of the more sustainable opportunities to provide for a mixed use development of employment and housing land well related to the existing urban form. The site represents a deliverable opportunity capable of early release to help address existing shortfalls in employment and housing land supply. The Promotional Document includes an indicative masterplan that demonstrates how the site can be developed to provide a mixed use development of 13.9 hectares of employment land and some 175 residential units. Initial discussions have taken place with Nottinghamshire County Council on potential access arrangements and a new spur off the A57/B6041/Woodsetts Lane roundabout is proposed. Further supporting technical studies are in preparation and will be submitted to the Council to demonstrate that the site is not subject to any overriding physical, land ownership or other constraints that would prevent development.

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
1399	7	<p>The Core Strategy sets out a requirement for Worksop to provide at least 32% of the district's housing requirement and at least 45% of the employment growth. Amendments to Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy following the Examination in Public also provide the flexibility to grant additional planning permissions to address shortfalls in housing and employment land supply. The Core Strategy Inspector in his report on the Examination in public noted a pressing need in the Worksop area to identify and bring forward additional housing sites. The Issues and Options Consultation Paper shows that there is also a very limited supply of employment land against the Core Strategy requirement of 48 hectares with only 1.12 hectares built or committed as at April 2011. It is important that the Site Allocations DPD makes provision for at least the level of housing provision for Worksop set out in the Core Strategy to ensure that the strategy of urban focus is delivered. It is also important that the Council works to bring forward additional employment and housing in the Worksop area at the earliest opportunity, in particular to address shortfalls in employment land supply and strengthen the 5 year housing land supply position. Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy provides the flexibility for the Council to grant additional permissions to address housing and employment land shortfalls and help deliver the strategy for Worksop. The land at Shireoaks Common provides a real opportunity to bring forward a mixed use development to provide new employment and housing to help deliver the Council's strategy for Worksop. Given the critical need to deliver additional employment land the Council should also consider the early release of the site in accordance with Policy CS1.</p>
1399	8	<p>Site 195/W8 at Shireoaks Common should be allocated in the Allocations DPD as a mixed use development opportunity to provide 13.9 hectares of employment land and some 175 dwellings. The Council should also consider the potential for the early release of the site to help address current shortfalls in supply. The Promotional Document submitted alongside these representations shows how the site can developed to provide a high quality mixed use employment and housing development.</p>
1399	9	<p>Part of the land at Shireoaks Common (site 195/W8) offers the potential to provide additional employment land to meet strategic requirements set out in the Core Strategy. The ELCS assessed the site as an attractive location for employment development due in part to the direct access off the A57. The Promotional Document submitted as part of these representations includes an indicative masterplan showing how some 13.9 hectares of employment land can be provided as part of a mixed use development proposal.</p>
1399	10	<p>Site 195/W8 is suitable for allocation for a mixed use development for employment and housing land. It is an unconstrained site well located on the A57. The site is well related to the existing urban area and as a site for additional employment land is attractive to the market. New housing development as part of the proposals would relate well to the settlement of Shireoaks and would enjoy easy access to the wide range of services and facilities available in Worksop. There are no overriding constraints to the development of the site and HLM is keen to bring the site forward for development at the earliest opportunity.</p>
1399	11	<p>Development of the land at Shireoaks Common would not affect any existing areas of open space. Development would not affect the St Luke's Primary School site. The indicative masterplan proposals allow for the extension of the school if required. There is also the opportunity to provide for a new access to the school from the new development to address existing access difficulties along Brancliffe Lane.</p>
1399	12	<p>The Issues and Options Consultation Paper suggests that some 100 dwellings could be redistributed from the Rural Service Centres. It would be appropriate for any remaining balance to be redirected to Worksop as the Sub-Regional Centre and the most sustainable location for further housing growth in the district.</p>
1399	13	<p>The proposal for this site is an employment led, mixed use development combining; 13.9 hectares of employment land for B2/B8 purposes; 5.85 hectares of residential land, delivering 175 dwellings at 30dph; 0.25 hectares for a potential school extension including new access</p>
1399	14	<p>The rationale for the proposal is the combination of a high quality employment site with the sustainability of the location. The adopted Core Strategy sets out a vision for Bassetlaw which, for Worksop, is to build on the town's role as the district's principal urban centre, with new business locations being established, taking advantage of the town's good connections to the strategic road network. Strategic objective SO2 is to provide a range and choice of employment sites, including in Worksop, The Core Strategy proposes to locate 45% of the employment land growth (48 hectares) to Worksop.</p>
1399	15	<p>The Bassetlaw Employment Land Study (ELCS) of January 2010 recognises that Bassetlaw District has few obvious advantages over other parts of the region to deliver economic growth. The report identifies that there is continued demand for medium sized warehousing units along the A1/A57 corridor and scope to attract further development if accessible sites are made available. Qualitative factors and the need to make adequate provision with sufficient developer choice is different parts of the District, suggest a need for Worksop, Retford, Harworth and the A1 corridor.</p>
1399	16	<p>The subject site was considered as part of the ELCS as Site W8 with the report noting that the site is flat, open, with few obvious constraints. It has the potential for a direct access off the A57 and appears to be an attractive location on a highly prominent site. The site scored 28 out of 35 in the study and was noted to be of good quality.</p>
1399	17	<p>In the report's recommendations at paragraph 8.6, it states; "As regards a further 10-15 hectare allocation in this vicinity, two potential sites, south of Worksop (W8) and Woodsetts Lane (W7) scored highly in the appraisal process. Whilst both sites would represent extensions into the open countryside, the former site, W8, is considered the better site due to its more even topography, increased prominence on the A57 and relationship to the urban area of Shireoaks. The need to develop part of this large site would be more pressing should Gateford Common 's progress be further stalled by ownership considerations". Accordingly it is the site's high score as a quality employment location (independently assessed in the ELCS), combined with its excellent relationship to the existing urban area, that makes the site and excellent opportunity to deliver a high quality, mixed use, sustainable development.</p>
1399	18	<p>The settlement of Shireoaks enjoys easy access to the wide range of services and facilities available in Worksop. Worksop town centre is some 4 kilometres to the south-east of the settlement. Good public transport connections are available including regular bus and rail services. The half hourly Stagecoach East Midlands Service 7/7a provides connections to Worksop town centre. Shireoaks Station provides rail connections to Worksop and also Sheffield and Lincoln. The Sustrans cycle route also provides largely traffic free connections to Worksop town centre along the Chesterfield Canal.</p>

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1399	19	Shireoaks is well located in relation to existing areas of employment at Shireoaks Business Centre and at Gateford Common. Mixed use development of the site will also provide additional local employment opportunities.
1399	20	Development of the site also provides the opportunity to allow for the expansion of St Luke's Primary School if required to meet needs arising from development in the area. This could address current difficulties with access from Brancliffe Lane, by providing a new access to the school from the new development.
1399	21	Criterion 1: Is the Local Community Supportive of the Development of the Site? The potential for a mixed use development on the site is set out as one of the options in the Issues and Options consultation document. We will review responses to the consultation document and seek to engage with Shireoaks Parish Council and the local community to explain our proposals for the site in more detail and address any concerns raised ahead of the Council's assessment of sites for inclusion in the Preferred Options Document. Responses to any consultation undertaken will be made available to officers.
1399	22	Criterion 2: Will Development of the site be compatible with existing and/or proposed neighbouring land uses? The proposed layout for the site will place the proposed new housing adjacent to existing residential properties and the primary school. The area of employment will be located adjacent to the A57 with an appropriate buffer between the new housing and employment areas.
1399	23	Criterion 3: Will the site help to deliver economic development opportunities? The Core Strategy requires the provision of a further 48 hectares of employment land at Worksop over the period to 2028. There has only been 0.16 hectares of employment land developed since 2010 and only 0.96 hectares are committed for employment uses. There is therefore a critical need to bring forward new employment Land at the earliest opportunity to address these shortfalls. The site will deliver some 13.9 hectares of new employment land in a location attractive to business with good connections via the A57 to the A1 and M1.
1399	24	The Employment Land Capacity Study assessed the site and concluded that it was an attractive site for employment development with a willing developer.
1399	25	Criterion 4: Will the site result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land? The Employment Land Capacity Study, January 2010 identifies the site as consisting of grade 3 agricultural land.
1399	26	Criterion 5: Will the site impact on a water source Protection Zone? The Water Cycle Study, January 2011 shows the site falling within the less sensitive zone 3 total catchment Source Protection Zone.
1399	27	Criterion 6: Will the site impact negatively on Landscape Character? The site falls within Policy Zone 08. Shireoaks located within the Magnesian Limestone Ridge landscape character sub- area. The Landscape Character Assessment places the zone in the 'create' landscape character zone. The Assessment identifies the area as visually significantly interrupted with a very weak functional integrity and a very poor landscape condition overall. A very weak sense of place combined with moderate visibility results in very low landscape sensitivity for the zone.
1399	28	The development provides the opportunity to provide a strengthened northern landscape edge in association with the proposed development to soften views of the northern edge of Shireoaks from views to the north. This landscaped edge could provide improved areas for informal recreation.
1399	29	Criterion 7: Will the development detract from or enhance the existing built character of the settlement or neighbourhood? Development of the site including a new landscaped buffer offers the opportunity to enhance the existing built character in the area where the northern edge of Shireoaks presents a relatively prominent feature in views from the north.
1399	30	Criterion 8: Will the development detract from or enhance the existing Green infrastructure of the settlement or neighbourhood? An existing public footpath runs to the west of St Luke's C of E Primary School providing a connection to the wider footpath network to the north of the site. A small footpath runs along the southern site boundary connecting to the A57. Through new areas of open space associated with the proposed housing and new buffer landscaping along the northern site boundary, there is scope to enhance the existing green infrastructure in the area.
1399	31	Criterion 9: Are there identified and unresolved constraints to the delivery of the site? There are no physical or site ownership constraints that would restrict the development of the site. HLM are keen to bring forward development proposals at the earliest opportunity to help address current shortfalls in employment and housing land supply.
1399	32	The topography of the site is gently sloping and would not represent a constraint to development. Initial discussions have been held with Nottinghamshire County Council on access arrangements for the site. Revisions to the A57/B6041/Woodsetts Lane roundabout are proposed to provide a new access to the site which would incorporate a segregated left turn lane northbound from the A57 into the site. Access to the proposed employment area would be provided from this revised roundabout. The revised junction arrangements show the potential to provide a toucan crossing facility if required. The need for this facility will be investigated further as part of work on a full Transport Assessment for the site. Access for the housing element would be from a separate point of access from Shireoaks Common.
1399	33	The assessment of the Land at Shireoaks Common shows that it represents a sustainable development opportunity that scores well against the assessment criteria set out by the Council. It represents a deliverable mixed use development opportunity to provide new areas of employment and housing well related to the existing settlement form.
1399	34	The site and its context have been subject to a number of related landscape character studies emanating from the National, County and Local levels. The Bassetlaw DC Landscape Character Assessment (2009) recognises the flat topography: views to the north; enclosure to the south and open arable farmland with little evidence of field boundaries. It describes the landscape condition as very poor, with distracting features including the A57 and the scrapyards (Fox Covert Dismantlers). It further describes the area as visually significantly interrupted. It has a weak sense of place, which combined with moderate visibility which results in very low landscape sensitivity. Landscape actions include creating new hedgerows and enhancing tree cover and landscape planting generally to create increased visual unity. It also acknowledges that creating woodland will contain and soften built development.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1399	35	A landscape and visual analysis of the site and its context has been undertaken. The) key points of analysis are as follows: The site context is visually discordant with a number of contrasting and conflicting elements e.g. highways corridors; industrial depots; varying elements of urban infrastructure etc.; An urban fringe character prevails to reduce the overall quality and sensitivity of what is a landscape that lacks structure and cohesion; The site retains a strong relationship with the urban edge of Shireoaks and the highways corridors; There is visual connectivity between the site and the landscape to the north; Reciprocally, whilst the site can be seen from locations to the north, typically this is in the context of the existing urban edge and a wide open panorama; The site is well contained to the south and west, and in part to the east, by existing built form and infrastructure; - Flat topography allows the landscape features such as hedgerows to maximise their screening value; and Whilst to the north and west of the site, large woodland blocks and belts offer a coherent and more robust landscape structure, they are conspicuous by their absence adjacent to the site.
1399	36	Based on the landscape character assessment key elements of a landscape and visual strategy to inform master planning of the site are as follows: Separation of employment and residential areas with a north-south green corridor to provide connectivity between the footpath on the southern site boundary and the wider landscape to the north: Planting along northern site boundary to create a Landscape structure to the site and provide visual containment for the site and the urban edge to the south; Introduction of a cellular network of hedgerow planting to define development cells potentially incorporating water features to add visual amenity and habitat biodiversity.
1400	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1400	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1400	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1400	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1400	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1400	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1401	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1401	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1401	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1401	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1401	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1401	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1402	1	Following the meeting of Blyth Parish Council on Monday 09 January 2012, all the councillors present voted to respond to the above individually and not collectively as requested by Bassetlaw.
1403	1	Rampton Parish Council does not have a view about the sites included in the Site Allocations Issues & Options Consultation
1404	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1404	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1404	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1404	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1404	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1404	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1405	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1405	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1405	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1405	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1405	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1405	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1406	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1406	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1406	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1406	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1406	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1406	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1407	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1407	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1407	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1407	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1407	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1407	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1408	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1408	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1408	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1408	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1408	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1408	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1409	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1409	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1409	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1409	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1409	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1409	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1410	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1410	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1410	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1410	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1410	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1410	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1411	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1411	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1411	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1411	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1411	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1411	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1412	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1412	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1412	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1412	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1412	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1412	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1413	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1413	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1413	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1413	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1413	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1413	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1414	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1414	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1414	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1414	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1414	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1414	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1415	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1415	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1415	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1415	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1415	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1415	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1416	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1416	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1416	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1416	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1416	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1416	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1417	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1417	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1417	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1417	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1417	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1417	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1418	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1418	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1418	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1418	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1418	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1418	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1419	1	I refer to our recent telephone conversation, and confirm that Claborough and Welham Parish Council does not intend to submit any written comments in relation to the recent consultation process.
1420	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1420	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1420	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1420	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1420	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1420	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1421	1	Vehicular access remains an on-going and to date unresolved problem primarily resulting from only 2 existing options, both T junctions onto busy B roads serving commuters to Sheffield, MI etc. and travelling to the villages of Carlton-in-Lindrick, Langold and Costhorpe. Both junctions continue to be unfit for purpose given current traffic load between the hours of 8 and 9am leading to unacceptable waiting times.
1421	2	Safety hazards including bus stops on both sides of B6041, additional busy T junctions serving further housing estates and a traffic light crossing, all of which prove challenging with some vehicles travelling at speeds in excess of 40mph.
1421	3	Existing proposals fail to address this realistically stating that any additional use of vehicles will be limited by 'prioritising people not cars' with the study claiming a 7% shift from car driving to bus use which is undoubtedly inaccurate with constant traffic congestion at peak times given that this is a critical outbound route for most people who live on the Ashes Park Estates.
1421	4	Current roundabout provision has already resulted in several minor road traffic accidents both related to existing usage and road condition surfaces in addition to poor and hazardous weather conditions.
1421	5	The large residential and nursing home for both older people and younger with physical disabilities also requires quick, easy and safe access at all times not only to promote community integration but also to provide emergency medical treatment.
1421	6	Existing school provision within the estate would undoubtedly require expansion resulting in a further increase of vulnerable pedestrians.
1421	7	Whilst we appreciate it may be easier and cheaper to add to an existing development, we are concerned at the proposed time duration and consequent disruption. Gateford residents have already experienced unpredictable losses of electricity and water supplies despite utilities having prior knowledge of demands suggesting planning agreement did not require any consideration of such factors.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1421	8	Existing proposals advise a development in excess of 700 properties to be built at a rate of 60 per annum, equating to almost 12 years of continued construction and disruption in relation to noise and traffic pollution and environmental damage.
1421	9	It seems unfair that Gateford residents who have already experienced significant disruption over a number of years should now be required to tolerate a further decade of the same.
1421	10	Improvements in existing infrastructure propose to include appropriate community resources and services which will require significantly more land and the creation of additional access routes, seemingly impossible within current highway infrastructure and existing housing.
1421	11	The developer's proposal of provision for a local neighbourhood centre' and 'recreational and community parkland' would be woefully inadequate given the assumption that this would add to existing retail and town facilities. Current local retail provision at Celtic Point will be insufficient for need with any artificially created playground being poor compensation for the loss of natural exposure to open countryside and farmland with wildlife habitats.
1421	12	The current local primary school cannot meet existing need therefore necessitating; more land being utilised for increased provision, further disruption, and further increase in the volume of vehicles on and off the estate to accommodate other potential out of area catchment families as well as additional staffing from outside of Worksop and the surrounding villages.
1421	13	Loss of agricultural and an open rural landscape seems a very rich price to pay when there are other potential realistic alternatives which whilst also utilising existing land, would not increase urbanisation with such a direct impact on existing open and wooded countryside with subsequent impact on wildlife.
1421	14	Bats are evident in the area despite the developer claiming that, 'no species of significance were recorded and' Legislation dictates that any structures or place which a bats use for shelter or protection are protected from damage or destruction whether occupied or not. This legislation has been incorporated into planning policies. This means that planning authorities have a legal obligation to consider whether bats are likely to be affected by a proposed development', (available on line at http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/planning.html).
1421	15	Owls are also evident despite no direct reference in current proposals and we would like to direct you to the following website of relevance in this case, also available online at, http://www.barnowltrust.org.uk/infopage.html?Id -88
1421	16	The use of existing bridleways for walkers and horses alike whilst preserved within current proposals would have much less benefit and attraction than currently.
1422	1	I do have a concern with plot reference 511, this has been allocated the title of flood plain, many times the field has held back water that would otherwise have caused havoc due to the poor maintenance of the Retford Beck, the worst flooding happened in July 2007, brown muddy water flooded off the hill behind Blacks Farm, some properties suffered water ingress but with the assistance of the Fire Brigade the flooding was contained and managed.
1422	2	After the flooding, Patrick Mercer organised 3 meetings with the residents from along the Retford Beck and the authorities involved IE Environmental Services, Severn Trent, Council etc., unfortunately to this day very little has been done, surveys and discussions and one new culvert near the level crossing: Points raised: 1, Lack of funds to improve the Retford Beck, 2, The ageing drainage system around Retford was not able to cope with the extra demand, 3, Environmental services would object to Planning of land around culverts and ditches along the Grove Coach Rd, Bracken Lane/ Retford Beck area as classified as flood plain. We live in fear of another down pour!
1422	3	Approximately 15 years ago Mrs Dawson who owns / rents some of the land around this area submitted planning to develop plot 511. if I remember correctly the planning was turned down on grounds of highways and flooding and was allocated the title of flood plain
1422	4	1 Highways and concern over Junction of Bracken Lane onto London Road (already an accident black spot) with bus stops either side of the junction on London Road.
1422	5	2, Flooding and classified as Flood plain
1422	6	Photos showing flooding have been sent to Natalie Cockrell at Bassetlaw Planning
1423	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1423	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1423	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1423	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1423	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1423	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1424	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1424	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1424	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1424	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1424	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1424	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1425	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1425	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1425	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1425	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1425	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1425	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1426	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1426	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1426	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1426	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1426	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1426	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1427	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1427	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1427	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1427	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1427	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1427	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1428	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1428	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1428	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1428	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1428	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1428	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1429	1	REMOVED
1429	2	Among all the buildings is there going to be any businesses or factories for people to work at.
1430	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1430	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1430	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1430	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1430	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1430	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1431	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1431	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1431	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1431	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1431	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1431	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1432	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1432	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1432	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1432	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1432	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1432	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1433	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1433	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1433	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1433	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1433	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1433	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1434	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1434	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1434	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1434	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1434	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1434	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1435	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1435	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1435	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1435	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1435	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1435	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1436	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1436	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1436	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1436	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1436	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1436	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1437	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1437	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1437	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1437	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1437	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1437	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1438	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1438	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1438	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1438	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1438	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1438	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1439	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1439	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1439	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1439	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1439	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1439	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1440	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1440	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1440	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1440	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1440	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1440	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1441	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1441	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1441	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1441	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1441	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1441	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1442	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1442	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1442	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1442	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1442	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1442	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1443	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1443	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1443	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1443	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1443	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1443	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1444	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1444	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1444	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1444	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1444	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1444	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1445	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1445	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1445	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1445	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1445	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1445	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1446	1	I have received a copy of the preliminary site plan with regard to the above development. My comments are: 1) Gringley already has a major development at Minster View. This will create a significant increase in population when the infrastructure of the village is limited.
1446	2	2) An important characteristic of the village is the narrow lanes and grassy verges. Low st is particularly narrow - further development will be detrimental to the lane and dangerous for the residents.
1446	3	3) This area of land was originally designated as "outside the village envelope". Areas "outwith the envelope" were intended to be protected from development in order to preserve the existence of open spaces within the village - a unique features of the village.
1446	4	This area has always been agricultural land.
1446	5	4) Despite the recommendations of the local authority with regard to protected areas, a planning application was lodged for development of this land. It appears that because an application had been lodged, when officers came to identify areas for future development to meet housing development targets, this land was identified as being suitable. Areas not affected by the planning guidelines were not chosen e.g. land to the south of Laycock Avenue. The selection process appears to be contrary to the planning policies.
1447	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1447	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1447	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1447	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1447	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1447	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1448	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1448	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1448	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1448	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1448	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1448	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1449	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1449	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1449	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1449	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1449	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1449	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1450	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1450	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1450	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1450	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1450	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1450	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1451	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1451	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1451	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1451	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1451	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1451	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1452	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1452	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1452	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1452	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1452	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1452	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1453	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1453	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1453	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1453	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1453	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1453	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1454	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1454	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1454	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1454	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1454	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1454	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1455	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1455	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1455	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1455	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1455	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1455	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1456	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1456	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1456	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1456	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1456	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1456	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1457	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1457	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1457	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1457	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1457	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1457	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1458	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1458	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1458	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1458	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1458	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1458	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1459	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1459	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1459	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1459	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1459	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1459	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1460	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1460	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1460	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1460	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1460	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1460	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1461	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1461	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1461	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1461	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1461	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1461	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1462	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1462	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1462	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1462	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1462	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1462	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1463	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1463	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1463	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1463	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1463	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1463	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1464	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1464	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1464	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1464	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1464	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1464	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1465	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1465	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1465	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1465	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1465	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1465	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1466	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1466	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1466	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1466	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1466	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1466	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1467	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1467	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1467	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1467	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1467	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1467	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1468	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1468	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1468	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1468	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1468	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1468	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1469	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1469	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1469	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1469	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1469	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1469	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1470	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1470	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1470	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1470	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1470	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1470	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1471	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1471	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1471	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1471	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1471	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1471	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1472	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1472	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1472	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1472	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1472	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1472	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1473	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1473	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1473	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1473	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1473	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1473	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1474	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1474	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1474	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1474	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1474	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1474	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1475	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1475	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1475	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1475	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1475	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1475	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1476	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1476	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1476	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1476	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1476	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1476	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1477	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1477	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1477	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1477	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1477	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1477	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1478	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1478	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1478	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1478	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1478	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1478	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1479	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1479	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1479	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1479	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1479	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1479	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1480	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1480	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1480	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1480	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1480	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1480	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1481	1	I have recently viewed a proposed development plan of six houses to be built at the rear of the bungalow on Low Street, Gringley. It is my opinion that this is an ideal small quality development for the future.
1481	2	Being situated well away from the roadside and behind an area, designated for landscaping.
1481	3	It would provide a large 'green area' to the front of the site, with the building to the rear being barely visible from the road .
1481	4	The village would suffer no loss of amenity what so ever, as the site is so well hidden. I doubt that 99.9% of residents have ever seen the proposed site.
1481	5	Development here would stop any spreading or enlargement of the village boundary.
1481	6	A village should always have a degree of development in future years, and while I believe a large scale of housing should not be made, this small proposed development like the right type of development.
1482	1	REMOVED
1483	1	I do not object to houses being built in Elkesley, as long as we do not get too many. 12 at the most.
1483	2	My reason being, 12 more would mean at least 24 more cars, as most houses have two cars.
1483	3	The drains in this village cannot take the waste now. We sometimes get raw sewage in our gardens.
1483	4	Very poorly kept roads. There are a lot of potholes.
1483	5	There is no Post Office or Doctor's surgery. Only one village shop which is very good but could not provide for a lot more.
1483	6	Hopefully OAP bungalows would be nice for Elkesley's residents.
1484	1	General Flood Risk Comments - Both Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS 25) and the draft National Planning Policy Framework seek to ensure that new development is not at increased vulnerability to the impacts of climate change. This is achieved by Local Plans applying a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development so as to avoid flood risk to people and property where possible and manage residual risk. The process for applying the flood risk Sequential Test to site allocations is set out in Figure 4.1 of the PPS 25 Practice Guide (Page 88) and we expect Bassetlaw District Council to apply the flood risk Sequential Test to the potential site allocations. If following application of the Sequential Test it is not possible, consistent with wider sustainability objectives, to allocate all development in areas with a lower probability of flooding then it may be appropriate to apply the Exception Test. We welcome the opportunity to discuss with Bassetlaw District Council issues concerning application of the flood risk Sequential and Exception Tests. You should also be aware that the governance of flood risk is currently changing as the various parts of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 are enacted. Under the new arrangements, the Environment Agency is the competent authority for main rivers, such as the River Trent, and for reservoirs. Nottinghamshire County Council has become the Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFA) for all other sources of flooding in the District including surface water, groundwater and ordinary watercourses. Nottinghamshire County Council has prepared a Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment which will form the basis of a Local Flood Risk Management Strategy. We advise that you liaise with Andy Wallace, Flood Risk Manager at Nottinghamshire County Council (Tel: 0115 9774590) regarding the new duties and responsibilities of the LLFA and their input into preparation of the emerging Site Allocations Plan.
1484	2	<u>Site Ref W1 - This potential employment site allocation is in close proximity to Solway Foods, which is a site that we regulate under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010. We consider that the site allocation process needs to take full account of this existing permitted site in order to avoid introducing potentially inappropriate development in close proximity to it. This is from the perspective of: a) exposing new sensitive receptors to perceived or actual environmental and human health impacts; and b) requiring permitted sites to meet tighter environmental standards. All permitted sites are publicly available to inspect on our website at: www.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby Please note that if this potential employment site is to be allocated for waste uses or industrial processes then it may require an Environmental Permit or Waste Exemption from us as well as planning permission. We want to work closely with you on such allocations to ensure that the planning and permitting regimes complement one another.</u>
1484	3	This site is also underlain by a Principal Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. Given the former uses on-site, there is the potential for development to cause pollution to the groundwater resource, which will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	4	<u>Site Ref W12 - This potential employment site allocation is in close proximity to Solway Foods, which is a site that we regulate under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010. We consider that the site allocation process needs to take full account of this existing permitted site in order to avoid introducing potentially inappropriate development in close proximity to it. This is from the perspective of: a) exposing new sensitive receptors to perceived or actual environmental and human health impacts; and b) requiring permitted sites to meet tighter environmental standards. All permitted sites are publicly available to inspect on our website at: www.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby Please note that if this potential employment site is to be allocated for waste uses or industrial processes then it may require an Environmental Permit or Waste Exemption from us as well as planning permission. We want to work closely with you on such allocations to ensure that the planning and permitting regimes complement one another.</u>
1484	5	This site is also underlain by a Principal Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. Given the former uses on-site, there is the potential for development to cause pollution to the groundwater resource, which will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1484	6	Site Ref W13 - Allocating this potential site for employment uses may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. This potential site allocation is bounded by the River Ryton to the south and the Chesterfield Canal to the north, with an Ordinary Watercourse flowing from north to south through the middle of the site. The site is located in varying Flood Zones, with Flood Zone 3 to the south and Flood Zone 1 in the northern area of the site. According to the Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), the majority of Flood Zone 3 is designated as Functional Floodplain, which is afforded the highest protection against development. Therefore, only water compatible uses are appropriate on these parts of the site. The flood risk constraints are extensive. The River Ryton poses a significant risk to a large proportion of the site, as shown in the SFRA. But also, the Ordinary Watercourse poses as a high risk, as the catchment of this watercourse extends to the railway line to the north (SK5754580230) and also there is an overflow weir from the canal. Thus, significant flows could be experienced along this un-modelled watercourse. Drawing No. 2008s3509-057 in the SFRA shows flooding due to surface water runoff in extreme events. This shows a large proportion of the site to be inundated to a depth in excess of 1m. Further adding to the significant flood risk constraints of the site. Please note that this potential site allocation does not benefit from any formal flood defences. Therefore, any development or raising of land levels within the floodplain will need to be compensated for by the lowering of an equivalent area and volume of land that is currently outside, but adjacent to, the floodplain. As this potential site allocation is located immediately adjacent to the River Ryton, which is designated as a Main River, our prior written consent is required for any works within 8 metres from the top of bank. We may wish for the 8 metres strip to be kept free of built development in order to safeguard our access to the River Ryton for essential maintenance and flood risk management work. This should be incorporated into development layouts and taken into account when making assumptions about the amount of development that can be accommodated on this site.
1484	7	This potential site allocation is also underlain by a Secondary B Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. Development of this site should give careful consideration to groundwater and environmental assessment.
1484	8	Site Ref 4 – Land East of Worksop - The southern part of this potential urban extension is located within 250m of Worksop Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). We understand that Severn Trent Water Ltd is proposing to build and operate an anaerobic digestion facility on or adjacent to the WwTW. Please note that permitted biowaste operations, such as the proposed anaerobic digestion facility, will often have an exclusion zone to nearby sensitive receptors, such as housing and places of work, as a precaution against the risk of bioaerosols. There may also be odour issues from the biowaste processes. We advise that you liaise with your Environmental Health Officer to discuss the implications of the proposed anaerobic digestion facility on the proposed urban extension. It may be that this issue only impacts upon possible option 1 which includes development on the majority of the site.
1484	9	Site Ref 14 - This potential site allocation is underlain by a Secondary A Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. Given the former uses on-site, there is potential for development to cause pollution to the groundwater resource, which will require careful consideration and environmental assessment. There is also a historic landfill within 250m of the site.
1484	10	Site Ref 15 - This potential site allocation is underlain by a Secondary Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 2 for a Public Water Supply. There is a historic landfill located within 250m of the site which will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	11	Site Ref 23 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	12	Site Ref 26 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	13	Site Ref 28 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	14	Site Ref 30 - This potential site allocation is underlain by a Principal Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. There is a historic landfill located within 250m of the site which will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	15	Site Ref 35 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	16	Site Ref 38 - This potential site allocation is underlain by a Secondary B Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 2 for a Public Water Supply. Given the former uses on-site, there is potential for development to cause pollution to the groundwater resource, which will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	17	Please note that a Ground Investigation Report has been submitted in support of a planning application for this site (Ref 69/11/00012) which has identified a number of contaminants with elevated concentrations. We've asked for more information on this issue.
1484	18	Site Ref 39 - This potential site allocation is underlain by a Principal Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. There is a historic landfill located within 250m of the site. Given the former uses on-site, there is potential for development to cause pollution to the groundwater resource, which will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	19	Site Ref 45 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	20	Site Ref 60 - This potential site allocation is underlain by a Principal Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. Given the former uses on-site, there is potential for development to cause pollution to the groundwater resource, which will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	21	Site Ref 90 - This potential site allocation is underlain by a Principal Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. There is a historic landfill located within 250m of the site. Given the former uses on-site, there is potential for development to cause pollution to the groundwater resource, which will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	22	Site Ref 151 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	23	Site Ref 153 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1484	24	Site Ref 195 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. An un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse flows from east to west across the site. At the western extreme of the site, there is a modelled flood risk from the River Ryton, backing up along this watercourse. Both of these sources of flood risk will require careful consideration and a site-specific hydraulic model of the Ordinary Watercourse will be required. Please note that this potential site allocation does not benefit from any formal flood defences from the River Ryton or the Ordinary Watercourse. Therefore, any development or raising of land levels within the floodplain will need to be compensated for by the lowering of an equivalent area and volume of land that is currently outside, but adjacent to, the floodplain. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, which offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	25	Site 218 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	26	Site Ref 343 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	27	Site Ref 348 - Unfortunately we couldn't locate this potential site allocation on the Worksop plan.
1484	28	Site Ref 371 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	29	Site Ref 374 - Unfortunately we couldn't locate this potential site allocation on the Worksop plan.
1484	30	Site Ref 561 - This potential site allocation is predicted to be isolated in a flood event, known as being a 'dry island', and occupants may be cut off from the surrounding highways during a flood event. Careful consideration will need to be given to whether it is appropriate to allocate this site for housing and if safe access and egress can be provided, including consideration of the likely depths and velocities of floodwater along the access and egress route to an area completely outside of the floodplain. This site is located immediately adjacent to the River Ryton, which is designated as a Main River. This means that our prior written consent is required for any works within 8 metres from the top of bank. We may wish for the 8 metres strip to be kept free of built development in order to safeguard our access to the River Ryton for essential maintenance and flood risk management work. This should be incorporated into development layouts and taken into account when making assumptions about the amount of housing that can be accommodated on this site. This potential site allocation is also underlain by a Principal and Secondary Aquifer. Given the former uses on-site, there is potential for development to cause pollution to the groundwater resource, which will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	31	Site Ref 570 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	32	Site Ref 1 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	33	Site Ref 3 - This potential site allocation may be at risk of flooding. An un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse flows from south to north through the site. Therefore, flood risk from this source should be considered within a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment. Please note drawing no. 2008s3509-060 from the Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, which shows that there is significant depth of flooding due to surface water run-off in extreme events within the western area of the site. The Ordinary Watercourse is just upstream of the Retford Beck, designated as a Main River. Retford Beck has a high level of flood risk associated with it downstream, therefore it is important that any development taking place on this site does not exacerbate downstream flooding. We recommend that surface water discharge rates be restricted as high as is practicably possible, and below Greenfield runoff rates. Please liaise with your own Drainage Engineer for further comment. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, which offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	34	Site Ref 6 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. This site is located within Flood Zone 2 from the adjacent Canal and a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment should consider the risk of flooding from the Canal and local sources.
1484	35	Site Ref 7 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. This site is located within Flood Zone 2 from the adjacent Canal and a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment should consider the risk of flooding from the Canal and local sources.
1484	36	Site Ref 10 - This potential site allocation is underlain by a Principal Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. We hold records of contamination associated with some parts of the site from the former use of the land. Development of this site has the potential to cause pollution to the groundwater resource and will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	37	Site Ref 27 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	38	Site Ref 37 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. According to our Flood Maps, the site is immediately adjacent to Flood Zone 2 from historic flood events. Unfortunately, we do not hold any detailed flooding information for this site. Therefore, a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment will be required to consider the issue of flood risk to the site.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1484	39	Site Ref 40 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. The eastern boundary of this site is located within Flood Zone 3, as confirmed by the Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. There is also a watercourse located along the eastern boundary, which is under the control of the River Idle and Ryton Internal Drainage Board. The risk of flooding from both of these sources should be carefully considered and no development should take place within their associated floodplains. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, which offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages. Also, an appropriate easement from the watercourse, incorporating a green corridor, should be provided.
1484	40	Site Ref 41 - This potential site allocation is located outside the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, there are Ordinary Watercourses located around the southern and eastern boundaries of the site. We advise you to confirm whether this Ordinary Watercourse is under the control of the River Idle and Ryton Internal Drainage Board. The risk of flooding from this source should be carefully considered and no development should take place within the associated floodplain. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, which offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages. Also, an appropriate easement from the watercourse, incorporating a green corridor, should be provided.
1484	41	Site Ref 46 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. According to our Flood Maps, the site is immediately adjacent to Flood Zone 2 from historic flood events. Unfortunately, we do not hold any detailed flooding information for this site. Therefore, a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment will be required to consider the issue of flood risk to the site.
1484	42	Site Ref 51 - This potential site allocation is located outside the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, there are Ordinary Watercourses abutting the northern and eastern boundaries of the site. Both of these Ordinary Watercourses are under the control of the River Idle and Ryton Internal Drainage Board and thus an appropriate easement maintained. The risk of flooding from this source should be carefully considered and no development should take place within the associated floodplain.
1484	43	Site Ref 52 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	44	Site Ref 53 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	45	Site Ref 58 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	46	Site Ref 69 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. This site is located within Flood Zone 2 from the adjacent Canal and a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment should consider the risk of flooding from the Canal and local sources. The site is also located upstream of a section of the Retford Beck. An Ordinary Watercourse flows through the site, which is likely to join to this watercourse via a culvert. This should be investigated in a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment. There should be no development within an appropriate easement of the watercourse and culvert (if confirmed). Retford Beck has a high level of flood risk associated with it downstream, therefore it is important that any development taking place on this site does not exacerbate downstream flooding. We recommend that surface water discharge rates be restricted as high as is practicably possible, and below Greenfield runoff rates. Please liaise with your own Drainage Engineer for further comment.
1484	47	Site Ref 70 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. According to our Flood Maps, the site is immediately adjacent to Flood Zone 2 from historic flood events. Unfortunately, we do not hold any detailed flooding information for this site. Therefore, a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment will be required to consider the issue of flood risk to the site. This potential site allocation is also underlain by a Principal Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. We hold records of contamination associated with some parts of the site from the former use of the land. Development on this site has the potential to cause pollution to the groundwater resource and will require careful consideration and environmental assessment. The site also lies within 250m of a historic landfill.
1484	48	Site Ref 71 - This potential site allocation is also underlain by a Principal Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. Given the former uses on-site, there is potential for development to cause pollution to the groundwater resource and will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	49	Site Ref 309 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. According to our Flood Maps, the site is immediately adjacent to Flood Zone 2 from historic flood events. Unfortunately, we do not hold any detailed flooding information for this site. Therefore, a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment will be required to consider the issue of flood risk to the site.
1484	50	Site Ref 336 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	51	Site Ref 342 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. The Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment shows that this potential site allocation is affected by flooding from the Retford Beck and the River Idle in a 1 in 1000 year event (Flood Zone 2). The Retford Beck, which is designated as a Main River, flows in culvert along the northern boundary of the site. If following investigation into the flood risk issues, this site is to be allocated for housing then the opportunity should be taken to remove the existing culvert where practically possible, in accordance with Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy. As the Retford Beck is designated as a Main River it means that our prior written consent is required for any works within 8 metres from the top of bank. We may wish for the 8 metres strip to be kept free of built development in order to safeguard our access to the Retford Beck for essential maintenance and flood risk management work. This should be incorporated into development layouts and taken into account when making assumptions about the amount of housing that can be accommodated on this site.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1484	52	This potential site allocation is also underlain by a Principal and Secondary A Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. There is a historic landfill located within 250m of the site. Given the former uses on-site, there is potential for development to cause pollution to the groundwater resource, which will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	53	Site Ref 364 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	54	Site Ref 370 - This potential site allocation is located adjacent to the Retford Beck, which is an Ordinary Watercourse at this section. The risk of flooding to the site should be investigated in a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment and an appropriate easement should be provided. Retford Beck has a high level of flood risk associated with it downstream, therefore it is important that any development taking place on this site does not exacerbate downstream flooding. We recommend that surface water discharge rates be restricted as high as is practicably possible, and below Greenfield runoff rates. Please liaise with your own Drainage Engineer for further comment.
1484	55	Site Ref 488 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. The Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment shows that this potential site allocation is affected by flooding from the Retford Beck in a 1 in 1000 year event (Flood Zone 2). As the Retford Beck is designated as a Main River it means that our prior written consent is required for any works within 8 metres from the top of bank. We may wish for the 8 metres strip to be kept free of built development in order to safeguard our access to the Retford Beck for essential maintenance and flood risk management work. This should be incorporated into development layouts and taken into account when making assumptions about the amount of housing that can be accommodated on this site. Retford Beck has a high level of flood risk associated with it downstream, therefore it is important that any development taking place on this site does not exacerbate downstream flooding. We recommend that surface water discharge rates be restricted as high as is practicably possible, and below Greenfield runoff rates. Please liaise with your own Drainage Engineer for further comment.
1484	56	Site Ref 489 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	57	Site Ref 511 - This potential site allocation is located adjacent to the Retford Beck, which is designated as a Main River. This means that our prior written consent is required for any works within 8 metres from the top of bank. We may wish for the 8 metres strip to be kept free of built development in order to safeguard our access to the Retford Beck for essential maintenance and flood risk management work. This should be incorporated into development layouts and taken into account when making assumptions about the amount of housing that can be accommodated on this site. Retford Beck has a high level of flood risk associated with it downstream, therefore it is important that any development taking place on this site does not exacerbate downstream flooding. We recommend that surface water discharge rates be restricted as high as is practicably possible, and below Greenfield runoff rates. Please liaise with your own Drainage Engineer for further comment.
1484	58	Site Ref 512 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	59	Site Ref 533 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	60	Site Ref 571 - This potential site allocation is located outside the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, there are Ordinary Watercourses abutting the northern and eastern boundaries of the site. Both of these Ordinary Watercourses are under the control of the River Idle and Ryton Internal Drainage Board and thus an appropriate easement maintained. The risk of flooding from this source should be carefully considered and no development should take place within the associated floodplain.
1484	61	Site Ref 572 - Unfortunately we couldn't locate this potential site allocation on the Retford plan.
1484	62	Site Ref H4 - This potential site allocation is underlain by a Principal Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. The site lies adjacent to a landfill, which will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	63	Please note that if this potential employment site is to be allocated for waste uses or industrial processes then it may require an Environmental Permit or Waste Exemption from us as well as planning permission. We want to work closely with you on such allocations to ensure that the planning and permitting regimes complement one another.
1484	64	Site Ref H6 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the northern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be carefully considered and no development should take place within the associated floodplain. An appropriate easement should be provided for the Ordinary Watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	65	This potential site allocation is also underlain by a Principal Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. Development of this site should give careful consideration to the groundwater resource and environmental assessment.
1484	66	Please note that if this potential employment site is to be allocated for waste uses or industrial processes then it may require an Environmental Permit or Waste Exemption from us as well as planning permission. We want to work closely with you on such allocations to ensure that the planning and permitting regimes complement one another.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1484	67	Site Ref 180 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. This potential site allocation is located within an area at risk of flooding (Flood Zones 3 and 2) from the Harworth Sewage Drain, which is designated as a Main River and runs through the site. Unfortunately, we do not hold any flooding information for Harworth Sewage Drain. The risk of flooding from this source should be carefully considered and no development should take place within the associated floodplain. As Harworth Sewage Drain is designated as a Main River it means that our prior written consent is required for any works within 8 metres from the top of bank. We may wish for the 8 metres strip to be kept free of built development in order to safeguard our access to the Harworth Sewage Drain for essential maintenance and flood risk management work. This should be incorporated into development layouts and taken into account when making assumptions about the amount of housing that can be accommodated on this site. Please note that this potential site allocation does not benefit from any formal flood defences. Therefore, any development or raising of land levels within the floodplain will need to be compensated for by the lowering of an equivalent area and volume of land that is currently outside, but adjacent to, the floodplain.
1484	68	This potential site allocation is also underlain by a Principal Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply, which will require careful consideration during any development.
1484	69	Site Ref 181 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	70	Site Ref 182 - This potential site allocation is underlain by a Principal Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. There is a historic landfill site located within 250m of the potential site allocation which will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	71	Site Ref 184 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	72	Site Ref 185 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	73	Site Ref 186 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	74	Site Ref 187 - This potential housing site allocation is in close proximity to Solvents With Safety, which is a site that we regulate under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010. Solvents With Safety is a solvent waste recovery facility that may produce solvent / chemical odours and noise. Odour issues have been a problem in the past and there is an on-going contaminated field to the rear of the site, for which the site operators are currently appraising options to remediate. We believe that careful consideration should be given to the appropriateness of residential development in close proximity to this permitted site and we ask that you liaise with your Environmental Health Officer over this matter. We consider that the site allocation process needs to take full account of this existing permitted site in order to avoid introducing potentially inappropriate development in close proximity to it. This is from the perspective of: a) exposing new sensitive receptors to perceived or actual environmental and human health impacts; and b) requiring permitted sites to meet tighter environmental standards. All permitted sites are publicly available to inspect on our website at: www.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby Whilst this potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1), there is an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse located along the northern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be carefully considered and no development should take place within the associated floodplain. An appropriate easement should be provided for the Ordinary Watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	75	Site Ref 188 - This potential site allocation is underlain by a Principal Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. Given the former uses on-site, there is potential for development to cause pollution to the groundwater resource, which will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	76	Site Ref 190 - We understand that this potential site allocation is part of the Harworth Colliery site, for which we have provided extensive comments through the planning process.
1484	77	Site Ref 191 - This potential site allocation is located on a former landfill site and is underlain by a Principal Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. Development on this site has the potential to cause pollution to the groundwater resource and will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	78	Site Ref 192 - This potential housing site allocation is in close proximity to Solvents With Safety, which is a site that we regulate under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010. Solvents With Safety is a solvent waste recovery facility that may produce solvent / chemical odours and noise. Odour issues have been a problem in the past and there is an on-going contaminated field to the rear of the site, for which the site operators are currently appraising options to remediate. We believe that careful consideration should be given to the appropriateness of residential development in close proximity to this permitted site and we ask that you liaise with your Environmental Health Officer over this matter. We consider that the site allocation process needs to take full account of this existing permitted site in order to avoid introducing potentially inappropriate development in close proximity to it. This is from the perspective of: a) exposing new sensitive receptors to perceived or actual environmental and human health impacts; and b) requiring permitted sites to meet tighter environmental standards. All permitted sites are publicly available to inspect on our website at: environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1484	79	Site Ref 193 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. This potential site allocation is located within an area at risk of flooding (Flood Zones 3 and 2) from the Harworth Sewage Drain, which is designated as a Main River and runs through the site. Unfortunately, we do not hold any flooding information for Harworth Sewage Drain. The risk of flooding from this source should be carefully considered and no development should take place within the associated floodplain. As Harworth Sewage Drain is designated as a Main River it means that our prior written consent is required for any works within 8 metres from the top of bank. We may wish for the 8 metres strip to be kept free of built development in order to safeguard our access to the Harworth Sewage Drain for essential maintenance and flood risk management work. This should be incorporated into development layouts and taken into account when making assumptions about the amount of housing that can be accommodated on this site. Please note that this potential site allocation does not benefit from any formal flood defences. Therefore, any development or raising of land levels within the floodplain will need to be compensated for by the lowering of an equivalent area and volume of land that is currently outside, but adjacent to, the floodplain.
1484	80	Site Ref 194 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	81	Site Ref 204 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	82	Site Ref 205 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	83	Site Ref 206 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	84	Site Ref 207 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	85	Site Ref 211 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	86	Site Ref 232 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	87	Site Ref 358 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	88	Site Ref 359 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	89	Site Ref 174 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	90	Site Ref 176 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	91	Site Ref 197 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	92	Site Ref 217 - Whilst this potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1), there is an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse located along the northern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be carefully considered and no development should take place within the associated floodplain. An appropriate easement should be provided for the Ordinary Watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	93	Site Ref 219 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	94	Site Ref 220 - This potential site allocation is underlain by a Principal Aquifer. Given the former uses on-site there is potential for development to cause pollution to the groundwater resource, which will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	95	Site Ref 385 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the eastern and southern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. The southern section of the Ordinary Watercourse is within culvert. No development should be located on top of the culvert and an easement should be provided, therefore a culvert survey detailing the location of the culvert should be undertaken. Culverts increase the risk of flooding due to blockage and thus this too should be considered in a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment. If following investigation into the flood risk issues, this site is to be allocated for housing then the opportunity should be taken to remove the existing culverts where practically possible, in accordance with Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	96	Site Ref 520 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	97	Site Ref 565 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	98	Site Ref 585 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	99	Site Ref 114 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	100	Site Ref 115 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	101	Site Ref 117 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. The site is located mainly within Flood Zone 1, apart from the northern section of the site, which is located in Flood Zone 3 from an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse located along the northern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1484	102	Site Ref 119 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	103	Site Ref 121 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	104	Site Ref 122 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	105	Site Ref 123 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the eastern and southern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	106	Site Ref 124 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	107	Site Ref 126 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	108	Site Ref 127 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. The site is located mainly within Flood Zone 1, apart from the northern section of the site, which is located in Flood Zone 3 from an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse located along the northern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	109	Site Ref 130 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	110	Site Ref 233 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	111	Site Ref 235 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	112	Site Ref 356 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	113	Site Ref 490 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	114	Site Ref 492 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	115	Site Ref 493 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	116	Site Ref 494 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	117	Site Ref 495 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	118	Site Ref 518 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	119	Site Ref 79 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	120	Site Ref 80 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. The western part of the site is located within Flood Zone 3 from the River Idle and it's associated tributaries. Please note that the area is under the control of Everton Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and thus we advise that surface water discharge rates are discussed with the IDB.
1484	121	Site Ref 86 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. The site is located within Flood Zone 2 from the River Trent and is within an area that has historically flooded. Please note that the area is under the control of Everton Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and Laneham IDB and thus we advise that surface water discharge rates are discussed with the IDBs.
1484	122	Site Ref 87 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	123	Site Ref 88 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	124	Site Ref 89 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	125	Site Ref 91 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	126	Site Ref 92 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	127	Site Ref 93 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	128	Site Ref 210 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	129	Site Ref 202 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. The site is located within Flood Zone 2 from the River Trent and is within an area that has historically flooded. Please note that the area is under the control of Everton Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and Laneham IDB and thus we advise that surface water discharge rates are discussed with the IDBs.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1484	130	Site Ref 481 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, there are several un-modelled Ordinary Watercourses located along the boundaries of the site. The risk of flooding from these sources should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourses. This site is located within an area under the control of Laneham Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and therefore we advise you contact IDB for any further comments. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourses. If access is required over the watercourses, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along the watercourses, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourses for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	131	Site Ref 498 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	132	Site Ref 499 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	133	Site Ref 564 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	134	We have no representations to make on potential housing site allocations in Beckingham as there are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon the sites.
1484	135	Site Ref 178 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. According to Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, this site is located within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) of the River Ryton and associated tributaries. The Functional Floodplain is afforded the highest protection against development. Therefore, only water compatible uses are appropriate on these parts of the site. Please note that this potential site allocation does not benefit from any formal flood defences. Therefore, any development or raising of land levels within the floodplain will need to be compensated for by the lowering of an equivalent area and volume of land that is currently outside, but adjacent to, the floodplain. Also, safe access and escape will be required to and from the site, including consideration of the likely depths and velocities of floodwater. We also advise that you contact the River Idle and Ryton Internal Drainage Board to comment on this development.
1484	136	Site Ref 213 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	137	Site Ref 214 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	138	Site Ref 266 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	139	Site Ref 369 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. According to Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, the northern part of this site is located within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) of the River Ryton and associated tributaries. The Functional Floodplain is afforded the highest protection against development. Therefore, only water compatible uses are appropriate on these parts of the site. Please note that this potential site allocation does not benefit from any formal flood defences. Therefore, any development or raising of land levels within the floodplain will need to be compensated for by the lowering of an equivalent area and volume of land that is currently outside, but adjacent to, the floodplain. Also, safe access and escape will be required to and from the site, including consideration of the likely depths and velocities of floodwater. We also advise that you contact the River Idle and Ryton Internal Drainage Board to comment on this development.
1484	140	Site Ref 482 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. According to Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, the northern part of this site is located within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) of the River Ryton and associated tributaries. The Functional Floodplain is afforded the highest protection against development. Therefore, only water compatible uses are appropriate on these parts of the site. Please note that this potential site allocation does not benefit from any formal flood defences. Therefore, any development or raising of land levels within the floodplain will need to be compensated for by the lowering of an equivalent area and volume of land that is currently outside, but adjacent to, the floodplain. Also, safe access and escape will be required to and from the site, including consideration of the likely depths and velocities of floodwater. We also advise that you contact the River Idle and Ryton Internal Drainage Board to comment on this development.
1484	141	Site Ref 517 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	142	Site Ref 589 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. According to Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, the northern part of this site is located within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) of the River Ryton and associated tributaries. The Functional Floodplain is afforded the highest protection against development. Therefore, only water compatible uses are appropriate on these parts of the site. Please note that this potential site allocation does not benefit from any formal flood defences. Therefore, any development or raising of land levels within the floodplain will need to be compensated for by the lowering of an equivalent area and volume of land that is currently outside, but adjacent to, the floodplain. Also, safe access and escape will be required to and from the site, including consideration of the likely depths and velocities of floodwater. We also advise that you contact the River Idle and Ryton Internal Drainage Board to comment on this development.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1484	143	Site Ref 590 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. According to Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, the northern part of this site is located within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) of the River Ryton and associated tributaries. The Functional Floodplain is afforded the highest protection against development. Therefore, only water compatible uses are appropriate on these parts of the site. Please note that this potential site allocation does not benefit from any formal flood defences. Therefore, any development or raising of land levels within the floodplain will need to be compensated for by the lowering of an equivalent area and volume of land that is currently outside, but adjacent to, the floodplain. Also, safe access and escape will be required to and from the site, including consideration of the likely depths and velocities of floodwater. We also advise that you contact the River Idle and Ryton Internal Drainage Board to comment on this development.
1484	144	We have no representations to make on potential housing site allocations in Clarborough and Hayton as there are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon the sites.
1484	145	Site Ref 303 - Whilst this potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1), it is bounded by the River Poulter. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	146	Site Ref 398 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	147	Site Ref 399 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	148	We have no representations to make on potential housing site allocations in East Markham as there are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon the sites.
1484	149	We have no representations to make on potential housing site allocations in Elkesley as there are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon the sites.
1484	150	Site Ref 296 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	151	Site Ref 345 - This potential site allocation is located on a former landfill site and is underlain by a Principal and lies within a Source Protection Zone 2 for a Public Water Supply. Development on this site has the potential to cause pollution to the groundwater resource and will require careful consideration and environmental assessment.
1484	152	Site Ref 400 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	153	Site Ref 401 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	154	Site Ref 405 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	155	Site Ref 406 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	156	Site Ref 407 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	157	Site Ref 408 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	158	Site Ref 409 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	159	Site Ref 453 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	160	Site Ref 477 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	161	Site Ref 484 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	162	Site Ref 412 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the northern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, which offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	163	Site Ref 413 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the northern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	164	Site Ref 534 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	165	Site Ref 577 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	166	We have no representations to make on potential housing site allocations in Gringley on the Hill as there are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon the sites.
1484	167	Site Ref 295 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1484	168	Site Ref 423 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. According to Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, the northern part of this site is located within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) of the River Ryton. The Functional Floodplain is afforded the highest protection against development. Therefore, only water compatible uses are appropriate on these parts of the site. Please note that this potential site allocation does not benefit from any formal flood defences. Therefore, any development or raising of land levels within the floodplain will need to be compensated for by the lowering of an equivalent area and volume of land that is currently outside, but adjacent to, the floodplain. Also, safe access and escape will be required to and from the site, including consideration of the likely depths and velocities of floodwater. We also advise that you contact the River Idle and Ryton Internal Drainage Board to comment on this development.
1484	169	Site Ref 424 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. According to Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, the extreme northern part of this site is located within the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) of the River Ryton. The Functional Floodplain is afforded the highest protection against development. Therefore, only water compatible uses are appropriate on these parts of the site. Please note that this potential site allocation does not benefit from any formal flood defences. Therefore, any development or raising of land levels within the floodplain will need to be compensated for by the lowering of an equivalent area and volume of land that is currently outside, but adjacent to, the floodplain. Also, safe access and escape will be required to and from the site, including consideration of the likely depths and velocities of floodwater. We also advise that you contact the River Idle and Ryton Internal Drainage Board to comment on this development.
1484	170	Site Ref 428 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	171	Site Ref 479 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	172	Site Ref 557 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	173	Site Ref 588 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	174	Site Ref 383 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. The site is located within Flood Zone 2 from the River Trent and River Idle and within an area of historic flood risk. Please note that the area is under the control of Finningley Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and thus we advise that surface water discharge rates are discussed with the IDB.
1484	175	Site Ref 480 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. The site is located within Flood Zone 2 from the River Trent and River Idle. Please note that the area is under the control of Finningley Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and thus we advise that surface water discharge rates are discussed with the IDB.
1484	176	Site Ref 504 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. The site is located within Flood Zone 2 from the River Trent and River Idle and within an area of historic flood risk. Please note that the area is under the control of Finningley Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and thus we advise that surface water discharge rates are discussed with the IDB.
1484	177	Site Ref 505 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. The site is located within Flood Zone 2 from the River Trent and River Idle and within an area of historic flood risk. Please note that the area is under the control of Finningley Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and thus we advise that surface water discharge rates are discussed with the IDB.
1484	178	Site Ref 506 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. The site is located within Flood Zone 2 from the River Trent and River Idle and within an area of historic flood risk. Please note that the area is under the control of Finningley Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and thus we advise that surface water discharge rates are discussed with the IDB.
1484	179	We have no representations to make on potential housing site allocations in Nether Langwith as there are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon the sites.
1484	180	Site Ref 162 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	181	Site Ref 164 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	182	Site Ref 165 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	183	Site Ref 200 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	184	Site Ref 262 - The access to this potential site allocation, through North Leverton, is located within Flood Zone 3. It is our understanding that the Brook, which runs through the village, caused flooding in 2007. We believe that Bassetlaw District Council's Drainage Engineers have done more specific assessment of the risk of flooding from this source, which should be used to inform the appropriateness of the potential allocation. Please note that safe access and escape will be required to and from the site, including consideration of the likely depths and velocities of floodwater.
1484	185	Site Ref 501 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	186	Site Ref 551 - The access to this potential site allocation, through North Leverton, is located within Flood Zone 3. It is our understanding that the Brook, which runs through the village, caused flooding in 2007. We believe that Bassetlaw District Council's Drainage Engineers have done more specific assessment of the risk of flooding from this source, which should be used to inform the appropriateness of the potential allocation. Please note that safe access and escape will be required to and from the site, including consideration of the likely depths and velocities of floodwater.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1484	187	Site Ref 586 - The access to this potential site allocation, through North Leverton, is located within Flood Zone 3. It is our understanding that the Brook, which runs through the village, caused flooding in 2007. We believe that Bassetlaw District Council's Drainage Engineers have done more specific assessment of the risk of flooding from this source, which should be used to inform the appropriateness of the potential allocation. Please note that safe access and escape will be required to and from the site, including consideration of the likely depths and velocities of floodwater.
1484	188	Site Ref 236 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	189	Site Ref 237 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	190	Site Ref 238 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	191	Site Ref 239 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the eastern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, which offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	192	Site Ref 464 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	193	Site Ref 228 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	194	Site Ref 230 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	195	Site Ref 231 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	196	Site Ref 483 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. The site is located within Flood Zone 2 from the River Trent and is within an area of historic flood risk.
1484	197	We have no representations to make on potential housing site allocations in Ranskill as there are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon the sites.
1484	198	Site Ref 454 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	199	Site Ref 455 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the south-eastern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	200	Site Ref 456 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the northern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	201	Site Ref 457 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	202	Site Ref 458 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the northern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	203	Site Ref 459 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	204	Site Ref 460 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	205	Site Ref 461 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	206	Site Ref 462 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	207	We have no representations to make on potential housing site allocations in Sutton cum Lound as there are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon the sites.
1484	208	Site Ref 280 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the southern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1484	209	Site Ref 286 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the southern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	210	Site Ref 293 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the western boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	211	Site Ref 294 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the southern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	212	Site Ref 349 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	213	Site Ref 353 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the northern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	214	Site Ref 366 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the southern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	215	Site Ref 368 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	216	Site Ref 437 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the western and southern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.
1484	217	Site Ref 438 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	218	Site Ref 442 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. The site is located within Flood Zone 2 from the River Trent and is within an area of historic flood risk. Please note that the area is under the control of Laneham Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and thus we advise that surface water discharge rates are discussed with the IDB.
1484	219	Site Ref 445 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. The southern part of the site is located within Flood Zone 2 from the Moor Drain, an Ordinary Watercourse that is located along the southern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages. We also advise that you contact the Laneham Internal Drainage Board to comment on this development.
1484	220	Site Ref 468 - This potential site allocation is located outside of the floodplain (Flood Zone 1). However, an un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the western and northern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. No development should be located within the associated floodplain and an appropriate easement should be provided for the watercourse. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, that offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1484	221	Site Ref 547 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	222	Site 4 - This site is also underlain by a Principal and Secondary Aquifer and lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a Public Water Supply. There are two groundwater abstraction licences adjacent to the site, which will need to be considered and protected during any development of this site.
1484	223	Site Ref 8 - There are no particular environmental constraints within our remit impacting upon this site.
1484	224	Site Ref 9 - This potential site allocation may be at risk of flooding. An un-modelled Ordinary Watercourse is located along the eastern boundary of the site. The risk of flooding from this source should be considered. It is our understanding that this watercourse enters a culvert at SK5689379036, and re-emerges at SK5707179161. No development should be located on top of the culvert and an easement should be provided, therefore a culvert survey detailing the location of the culvert should be undertaken. Culverts increase the risk of flooding due to blockage and thus this too should be considered in a site specific Flood Risk Assessment. If following investigation into the flood risk issues, this site is to be allocated for housing then the opportunity should be taken to remove the existing culverts where practically possible, in accordance with Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy. We recommend that there is no additional culverting of the watercourse. If access is required over the watercourse, then a clear span bridge should be utilised. We also recommend that a green corridor is provided along this watercourse, which offers biodiversity and amenity opportunities, whilst also allowing any emergency access to the watercourse for maintenance or removal of blockages. This appears to be lost along the right bank.
1484	225	Site Ref 11 - Allocating this potential site for housing may be contrary to Policy DM12 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy due to the site being located within an area of flood risk. This site is located within the River Ryton floodplain. From comparing the proposed site boundary to the Bassetlaw Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, we believe that the northern boundary of the site will be affected by flooding in a 1 in 20 year (Functional Floodplain) event. Please note that this potential site allocation does not benefit from any formal flood defences. Therefore, any development or raising of land levels within the floodplain will need to be compensated for by the lowering of an equivalent area and volume of land that is currently outside, but adjacent to, the floodplain.
1484	226	Subsequent to our representation on the Site Allocations Issues and Options consultation, I've been made aware that potential site 9 in Worksop is adjacent to land that the Environment Agency has identified as being suitable for holding back floodwater as a way of reducing the risk of flooding to Worksop. Please find attached a copy of a report published in 2008 looking at potential flood risk management options - Figure 2 (Drawing Number B1044600/Report/02) indicates the area of potential floodplain storage adjacent to Site Ref 9.
1485	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1485	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1485	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1485	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1485	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1485	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1486	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1486	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1486	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1486	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1486	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1486	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1487	1	The clients acknowledge that the Council as Local Planning Authority can, particularly in rural areas, allocate as much or as little land as it deems appropriate.
1487	2	The clients respect the views of the community but respectfully question whether 15 houses up to 2028, acknowledging existing permissions, would be sufficient to cater for the needs of the village over this period. For the following reasons, Q93 refers: Settlements need to grow in a sustainable manner to allow young people to stay in the settlement in which they were either born or brought up if that is their wish; in addition, settlements need to grow in a sustainable manner to support social infrastructure such as shops, post office and school to ensure they remain viable.
1487	3	The present site is small but could accommodate the type of dwellings suggested by the community. The position of the site is such that it is close to the centre of the village and within walking distance of the following amenities: pub; school; shop/Post Office; Doctors; Petrol Station (SHLAA site 200); Methodist chapel; Church; Orchard House Private Church. Also noted, there is a bus stop in close proximity to the site. Public transport from this location will enable patrons to travel to either Retford or Gainsborough and travel through adjacent villages and principally operates on a commuter timetable. It should be noted that the bus stops sited in the centre of the village operate on a regular basis throughout the day. It has been determined Broadband speeds within the area are 5 - 6 MB which is just below the national average but will support a homeworking environment.
1487	4	Design considerations/Adjacent Architectural Influences. For your information, the site is within close proximity to three Grade II listed buildings and therefore the design of this site needs to take into account the location of these listed buildings when setting out the design philosophy for the site. The Barn at Yew Tree Farm; Cow House and Stable with Pigeoncote Above; and Sundial House.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1487	5	Architectural styles immediately adjacent to the site contain a mixture of styles and influences and can be categorised into two distinctive groups Late 19thC architecture depicting predominantly rural/agricultural architectural influences apart from Sundial House which is a Georgian Manor House that would have probably been occupied by a large land owner of that period. Modern derived architecture based on cost and convenience which has been obviously used and adopted for infill purposes.
1487	6	Design. It would be possible to design a scheme using traditional architecture for north Notts and incorporate Notts vernacular details as depicted in N Leverton and other villages in Bassetlaw and the Trent Valley. These will not form negative pastiche designs of the past which have been imported in to the village before planning became more proactive, assisted and strengthened by Conservation. Initial design principles will take into consideration 19thC architecture, good examples of which can be found in North Leverton and the immediate area. These are not predominantly rural based and portray a mix of agricultural uses and style for example humble cottages incorporating cat slide roof design principles, agricultural barns, granaries and cart sheds. Boundary infrastructure will be predominantly open to maintain what will be a singular agricultural defined element and soft boundary will be adopted on extremities and garden areas to the rear.
1487	7	Energy. Minimising energy consumption by utilising high levels of insulation, building orientation to maximise solar gains and shelter from prevailing winds, maximising day lighting, energy efficient lighting and appliances.
1487	8	Water. Consumption and water efficiency will be controlled and the use of rainwater harvesting for both internal and external uses, water efficient appliances to be adopted, minimising and attenuating surface water runoff to prevent flooding by using permeable paving and other materials.
1487	9	Transport: Location near to public transport routes, proximity to amenities and places of work, space for home working -e.g. home office to reduce commuting.
1487	10	Materials: use of long-life materials of low environmental its impact during extraction, manufacture and use, avoid using toxic materials and those from non-renewable and non-sustainable sources, use of materials which can be reused I recycled, use of locally produced materials to reduce transportation requirements, use of recycled materials.
1487	11	Health and wellbeing: use of non-toxic finishes and materials, natural day lighting, freedom from noise, indoor air quality, private outdoor space, green space, design for community and 'sense of place', integration with the surroundings/landscape
1487	12	Affordability: minimise the cost of ownership , flexibility and adaptability to meet the changing needs of present and future occupiers-Building for Life.
1487	13	Access. There is an existing access to the site and an existing building adjacent to the highway. Depending on the number of units allocated to the site if applicable, provisions for the demolition of this outbuilding may have to be taken into account. Vehicle visibility splays from the site are good and 2.4m can be maintained from the access to the near kerb if the adjacent hedgerow to the east is managed. Pedestrian visibility splays are excellent but provisions for footway traffic adjacent to the access/across the frontage should be adopted. Any proposed development of the site does not affect the Public Right of Way which is adjacent to the site.
1487	14	Although it has already been mentioned and commented on in relation to the needs of the settlement to grow in a sustainable manner, the client feels that it is of vital importance for the reasons already mentioned. It does however need to be stressed that for the community to be viable sustainable growth is necessary. Failing this, social infrastructure will inevitably decline with the result that the Government's drive for sustainable communities will be diluted and the drive for carbon reduction put under threat.
1488	1	The southern boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1488	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1488	3	In addition there will be significant loss of amenity.
1488	4	Local infrastructure will not cope and occupants of new houses would have to drive significant distances for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1488	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1488	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1489	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1489	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1489	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1489	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1489	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1489	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1490	1	The clients acknowledge that the Council as Local Planning Authority can, particularly in rural areas, allocate as much or as little land as it deems appropriate.
1490	2	Mr and Mrs Bland respects the views of the community but respectfully questions whether 15 houses up to 2028 acknowledging existing permissions would be sufficient to cater for the needs of the village over this period for the following reasons: Settlements need to grow in a sustainable manner to allow young people to stay in the settlement in which they were either born or brought up if that is their wish. In addition, our clients feel that Rural Service Centres need to be allowed to grow in a sustainable manner to support on social infrastructure such as shops, post office and school to ensure they remain viable.
1490	3	It is felt that this site is so positioned as to form a natural extension to the settlement. The site is close to amenities as highlighted below and is of such a size that depending on the Council's Policy, as much or as little of the site can be used.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1490	4	The position of the site is such that it is close to the centre of the village and within walking distances of the following amenities Public House School-North Leverton C of E Primary School Shop! Post Office Doctors Surgery Petrol Station (site pre allocated SHLAA Reference 200) Methodist Chapel Church Private School -Orchard House (Ages 5-16) located between North and South Leverton -Not shown the site plan. As can be noted there is a bus stop located within close proximity to the site which is highlighted on the enclosed site plan for convenience. Public Transport from this location will enable patrons to travel to either Retford or Gainsborough, a service that operates regularly throughout the day. It has been determined that Broadband Speeds within the area are 2.3mb to 6.1 mb which is just below the national average but will support a home working environment
1490	5	For your information the site is in close proximity to a Grade Two Listed Building and therefore the design of any development on this site will need to take into account the location of this Listed Building in the design philosophy and the other existing forms of development should the site be selected Description: White Lodge and Outbuilding Grade: 2 Date Listed: 4 December 1985 English Heritage Building ID: 410393
1490	6	Architectural styles immediately adjacent to the site contain a mixture of styles and influences and can be categorised into two distinctive groups Late 19th , early 20th Century Architecture depicting predominantly simple North Nottinghamshire Vernacular Style ; Modern derived architecture which has to an extent been sympathetically adopted.
1490	7	Should the site be selected for further consideration then the Communities Preference for three bedroomed detached and semi-detached houses and or bungalows could be accommodated which could include a tenure mix that reflects the needs of the Community. It is noted that a Grade 2 Listed Building is located south of the site as detailed above, although with good design it is considered that this will be affected by the development of the site should the Council as Local Planning Authority deem that the site is suitable . A further advantage of the site is that it lends itself to the form of development as recommended in the Guide : Building for Life, which is the national recommended standard for well-designed homes and neighbourhoods incorporating an accommodation mix that reflects the needs and aspirations of the local community and have easy access to public transport and the facilities provided within . Rural Services Centres. It would be possible to design a scheme using traditional architecture for North Nottinghamshire and incorporate Nottinghamshire Vernacular details as depicted in North Leverton and other villages within Bassetlaw and the Trent Valley. These will not form negative pastiche designs of the past which have been imported into the village before planning became more proactive assisted and strengthened by Conservation. Although design would come later if the site was selected, a scheme could be created which enhances and creates a distinctive character not only of a high architectural standard but also a strong landscape strategy.
1490	8	In the design of the site in terms of both layout and the design of individual units, it is proposed to adopt a sustainable approach to the development by : Energy: minimising energy consumption by utilising high levels of insulation, building orientation to maximise solar gains and shelter from prevailing winds, maximising day lighting, energy efficient lighting and appliances
1490	9	Water: consumption and water efficiency will be controlled and the use of rainwater harvesting adopted for both internal and external uses, water efficient appliances to be adopted, minimising and preventing surface water run-off to prevent flooding by using permeable paving or other materials.
1490	10	Transport: Location near to public transport routes, proximity to amenities and places of work, space for home working -e.g. home office to reduce commuting.
1490	11	Materials: use of long-life materials of low environmental its impact during extraction, manufacture and use, avoid using toxic materials and those from non-renewable and non-sustainable sources, use of materials which can be reused I recycled, use of locally produced materials to reduce transportation requirements, use of recycled materials
1490	12	Health and wellbeing: use of non-toxic finishes and materials, natural day lighting, freedom from noise, indoor air quality, private outdoor space, green space, design for community and 'sense of place', integration with the surroundings I landscape
1490	13	Affordability: minimise the cost of ownership , flexibility and adaptability to meet the changing needs of present and future occupiers-Building for Life.
1490	14	Due to the size or the site details relating to both infrastructure of the site and access onto Southgore Lane will need to be supplied in accordance with the requirements of Nottinghamshire County Council as Highways Authority. Together with associated traffic statements etc.
1490	15	Although it has already been mentioned and commented on in relation to the needs of the settlement to be provided to ensure that the social infrastructure remains viable is the related national objective of reducing carbon immersion nationally. If local infrastructure is not supported inevitably it will decline that in turn will result on the over reliance of motorised transportation that will have an effect on aspirations not only of national policy but also that of the world community.
1490	16	Should the site be selected it is respectfully suggested that space around the buildings is as important as the buildings themselves and therefore design is paramount such space if properly designed ~only enhance the development but the area as a whole
1491	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1491	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1491	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1491	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1491	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1491	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1492	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1492	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
1492	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1492	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1492	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1492	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1493	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1493	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1493	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1493	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1493	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1493	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1494	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1494	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1494	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1494	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1494	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1494	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1495	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1495	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1495	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1495	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1495	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1495	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1496	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1496	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1496	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1496	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1496	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1496	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1497	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1497	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1497	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1497	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1497	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1497	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1498	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1498	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1498	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1498	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1498	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1498	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1499	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1499	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1499	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1499	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1499	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1499	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1500	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1500	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1500	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1500	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1500	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1500	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1501	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1501	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1501	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1501	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1501	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1501	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1502	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1502	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1502	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1502	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1502	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1502	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1503	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1503	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1503	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1503	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1503	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1503	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1504	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1504	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1504	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1504	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1504	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1504	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1505	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1505	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1505	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1505	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1505	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1505	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1506	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1506	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1506	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1506	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1506	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1506	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1507	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1507	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1507	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1507	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1507	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1507	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1508	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1508	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1508	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1508	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1508	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1508	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1509	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1509	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1509	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1509	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1509	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1509	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1510	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1510	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1510	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1510	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1510	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1510	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1511	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1511	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1511	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1511	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1511	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1511	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1512	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1512	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1512	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1512	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1512	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1512	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1513	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1513	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1513	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1513	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1513	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1513	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1514	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1514	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1514	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1514	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1514	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1514	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1515	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1515	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1515	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1515	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1515	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1515	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1516	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1516	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1516	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1516	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1516	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1516	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1517	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1517	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1517	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1517	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1517	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1517	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1518	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1518	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1518	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1518	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1518	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1518	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1519	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1519	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1519	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1519	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1519	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1519	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1520	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1520	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1520	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1520	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1520	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1520	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1521	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1521	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1521	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1521	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1521	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1521	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1522	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1522	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1522	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1522	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1522	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1522	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1523	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1523	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1523	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1523	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1523	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1523	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1524	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1524	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1524	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1524	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1524	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1524	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1525	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1525	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1525	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1525	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1525	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1525	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1526	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1526	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1526	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1526	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1526	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1526	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1527	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1527	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1527	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1527	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1527	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1527	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1528	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1528	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1528	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1528	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1528	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1528	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1529	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1529	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1529	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1529	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1529	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1529	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1530	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1530	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1530	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1530	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1530	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1530	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1531	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1531	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1531	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1531	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1531	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1531	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1532	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1532	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1532	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1532	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1532	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1532	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1533	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1533	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1533	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1533	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1533	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1533	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1534	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1534	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1534	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1534	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1534	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1534	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1535	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1535	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1535	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1535	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1535	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1535	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1536	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1536	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1536	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1536	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1536	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1536	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1537	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1537	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1537	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1537	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1537	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1537	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1538	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1538	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1538	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1538	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1538	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1538	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1539	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1539	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1539	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1539	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1539	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1539	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1540	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1540	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1540	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1540	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1540	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1540	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1541	1	The current Southern Boundary to Retford is well defined and provides a consistent and appealing entrance to the town and this would be lost by these developments.
1541	2	It is important to maintain a distinctive boundary between the urban area and the open agricultural land and the current town limit does precisely that.
1541	3	There will be a significant loss of amenity
1541	4	The local infrastructure will not cope with and occupants of the new housing would have to drive a significant distance for shops, schools, doctors and other facilities.
1541	5	There are more appropriate areas of land within the existing Retford town boundaries for housing.
1541	6	I do however support the expansion of industrial land on North Road through sites 51 and R7 as this will help further strengthen the Randall Way employment area.
1542	1	Question 36 of the Councils Consultation Paper The applicants/contenders / owners respect the views of the residents and the Local Community but in relation to Question 36 have the following observations : they acknowledge that the Council as Local Planning Authority can, particularly in rural areas allocate as much or as little land as it deems appropriate.
1542	2	For social infrastructure to remain viable settlements need to grow in a sustainable way. If one considers social/infrastructure as a system then an important component of the system are young people. It is contended that young people born and brought up in the village should be able to find accommodation in the village and remain in the village if they so wish
1542	3	The site being located in the centre of the village a setting created by existing buildings some of which are rich with archaeology incorporating important natural
1542	4	As the site is located within the centre of the village and part of the site was located within the former development envelope it is available and sustainable, whereas it could be argued that sites located on the fringes of the settlement do not lend themselves or contain these advantages
1542	5	The question as to whether a new public house is constructed is based purely on economics. Public Houses have been closing nationally, the reason for the closures being purely economic. The village public is an institution in itself but whether they are economically viable we will have to leave to others to decide. One thing that is certain these advantages.
1542	6	We would like to emphasize the link between sustainability and the viability of social infrastructure. Should social infrastructure decline or become economically unviable, carbon dependency will increase and this is counter not only to government aims, but also that of the World Community.
1543	1	We act for Messrs G. Howcroft and Son and following research make this application on their behalf. The applicant supports community involvement in the planning process and in support of the application appends the following information for the Councils consideration
1543	2	The site is accessible to the local road network and is strategically placed for access to the strategic or national road network.
1543	3	The site is in close proximity to the urban centre, Retford Town Centre, by public transport and through the use of the cycle although it is conceded that this is not the case by foot traffic. However it is felt that as the site is strategically placed for the National Road Network adds weight to its suitability for development
1543	4	Although as already conceded access to Retford Town Centre is not possible other than by public transport, local shops are available in the local area which provides in effect a satellite service centre.
1543	5	The site is compatible with existing uses and would seem to provide a natural extension to the existing development at the junction of High Street and Ollerton Road. The applicant is willing to work together with the Council to ensure that proposals are and can be properly integrated. The applicant contends that this is important as new development does not exist on its own and that streets and footpaths should be connected creating a development that is easy to get into and around reference Buildings for Life.
1543	6	The applicant feels that should collaboration with adjacent land owners through the Council be possible then the design of public open space can be integrated in that often public space is the area left once buildings have been planned and often lead to undefined areas with no specific use.
1543	7	The applicant feels that the site is of such a size and location that lends its effect a tenure mix to be provided that reflects the needs of the local community whilst at the same time allowing dwellings to be designed with internal spaces and layout that allows for adaptation, conversion or extension to cater for future demands and lifestyles.
1543	8	The applicant is of the opinion that the suggestions or objectives put forward in this submission can be achieved through the advances in construction technology that can enhance the performance of buildings both in quality and in attractiveness and particularly in achieving buildings that outperform statutory minima such as Building Regulations
1543	9	Question 9 This will depend on the circumstances and should be flexible depending on need. The main criteria should benefit to the town, For example, should a large employer wish to locate his/her operation/organisation within Retford, lack of land for housing should not deter or even prejudice his/her decision to locate.
1543	10	The applicant promotes this site for the reasons highlighted

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1543	11	Question 11 The applicant feel that here again flexibility is probably the best approach whereas in the past specific areas or sites needed to be designated . This was as a result of the type of industry or process carried out.
1543	12	Today when taking into account the industrial scene, Hi-Tech industries seem to both future, such uses could be located in residential areas. An example of such a location is PA Business Systems operation which is located in Hallcroft, Retford.
1543	13	Yes Please refer to Question II above.
1543	14	The applicants support the Council's philosophy on the provisions of open space. The applicants contend that without protection the areas are vulnerable to change. Having said this the applicant to that fur a development to be successful as already mentioned, well designed public spaces suitably managed should form part of any development proposal
1544	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1544	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1544	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1544	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1544	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1544	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1544	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1544	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1544	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1544	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1544	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1544	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1544	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1544	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1544	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1544	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1544	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1544	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1544	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered G to this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1544	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1545	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1545	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1545	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1545	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1545	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1545	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1545	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1545	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1545	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1545	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1545	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1545	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1545	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1545	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1545	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1545	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1545	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1545	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1545	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1545	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1546	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1546	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1546	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1546	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1546	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1546	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1546	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1546	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1546	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1546	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1546	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1546	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1546	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1546	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1546	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1546	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1546	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1546	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1546	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1546	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1547	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1547	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1547	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1547	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1547	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1547	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1547	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1547	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1547	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1547	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1547	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1547	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1547	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1547	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1547	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1547	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1547	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1547	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1547	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1547	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1548	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1548	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1548	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1548	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1548	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1548	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1548	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1548	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1548	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1548	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1548	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1548	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1548	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1548	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1548	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1548	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1548	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1548	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1548	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1548	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1549	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1549	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1549	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1549	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1549	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1549	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1549	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1549	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1549	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1549	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1549	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1549	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1549	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1549	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1549	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1549	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1549	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1549	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1549	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1549	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1550	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1550	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1550	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1550	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1550	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1550	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1550	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1550	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1550	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1550	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1550	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1550	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1550	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1550	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1550	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1550	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1550	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1550	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1550	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1550	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1551	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
1551	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1551	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1551	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1551	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1551	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1551	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1551	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1551	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1551	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1551	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1551	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1551	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1551	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1551	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1551	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1551	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1551	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1551	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1551	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1552	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1552	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1552	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1552	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1552	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1552	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1552	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1552	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1552	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
1552	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1552	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1552	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1552	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1552	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1552	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1552	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1552	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1552	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1552	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1552	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1553	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1553	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1553	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1553	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1553	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1553	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1553	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1553	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1553	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1553	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1553	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1553	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1553	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1553	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1553	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1553	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1553	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1553	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1553	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1553	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1554	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1554	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1554	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1554	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1554	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1554	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1554	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1554	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1554	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1554	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1554	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1554	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1554	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1554	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1554	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1554	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1554	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1554	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1554	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1554	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1555	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1555	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1555	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1555	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1555	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1555	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1555	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1555	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1555	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1555	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1555	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1555	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1555	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1555	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1555	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1555	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1555	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1555	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1555	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1555	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1556	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1556	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1556	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1556	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1556	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1556	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1556	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1556	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1556	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1556	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1556	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1556	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1556	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1556	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1556	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1556	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1556	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1556	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1556	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1556	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1557	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1557	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1557	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1557	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1557	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1557	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1557	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1557	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1557	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1557	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1557	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1557	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1557	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1557	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1557	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1557	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1557	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1557	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1557	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1557	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1558	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1558	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1558	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1558	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1558	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1558	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1558	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1558	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1558	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1558	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1558	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1558	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1558	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1558	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1558	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1558	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1558	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1558	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1558	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1558	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1559	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1559	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1559	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1559	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1559	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1559	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1559	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1559	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1559	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1559	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1559	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1559	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1559	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1559	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1559	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1559	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1559	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1559	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1559	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1559	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1560	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1560	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1560	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1560	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1560	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1560	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1560	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1560	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1560	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1560	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1560	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1560	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1560	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1560	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1560	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1560	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1560	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1560	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1560	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1560	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1561	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1561	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1561	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1561	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1561	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1561	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1561	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1561	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1561	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1561	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1561	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1561	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1561	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1561	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1561	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1561	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1561	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1561	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1561	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1561	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1562	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1562	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1562	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1562	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1562	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1562	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1562	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1562	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1562	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1562	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1562	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1562	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1562	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1562	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1562	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1562	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1562	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1562	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1562	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1562	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1563	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1563	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1563	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1563	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1563	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1563	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1563	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1563	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1563	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1563	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1563	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1563	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1563	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1563	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1563	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1563	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1563	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1563	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1563	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1563	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1564	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1564	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1564	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1564	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1564	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1564	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1564	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1564	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1564	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1564	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1564	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1564	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1564	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1564	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1564	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1564	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1564	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1564	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1564	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1564	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1565	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1565	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1565	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1565	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1565	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1565	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1565	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1565	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1565	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1565	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1565	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1565	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1565	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1565	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1565	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1565	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1565	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1565	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1565	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1565	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1566	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1566	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1566	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1566	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1566	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1566	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1566	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1566	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1566	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1566	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1566	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1566	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1566	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1566	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1566	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1566	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1566	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1566	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1566	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1566	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1567	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1567	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1567	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1567	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1567	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1567	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1567	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1567	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1567	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1567	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1567	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1567	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1567	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1567	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1567	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1567	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1567	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1567	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1567	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1567	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1568	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1568	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1568	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1568	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1568	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1568	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1568	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1568	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1568	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1568	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1568	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1568	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1568	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1568	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1568	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1568	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1568	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1568	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1568	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1568	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1569	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1569	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1569	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1569	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1569	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1569	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1569	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1569	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1569	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1569	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1569	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1569	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1569	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1569	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1569	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1569	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1569	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1569	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1569	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1569	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1570	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1570	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1570	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1570	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1570	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1570	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1570	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1570	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1570	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1570	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1570	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1570	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1570	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1570	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1570	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1570	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1570	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1570	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1570	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1570	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1571	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1571	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1571	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1571	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1571	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1571	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1571	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1571	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1571	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1571	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1571	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1571	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1571	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1571	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1571	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1571	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1571	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1571	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1571	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1571	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1572	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1572	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1572	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1572	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1572	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1572	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1572	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1572	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1572	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1572	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1572	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1572	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1572	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1572	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1572	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1572	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1572	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1572	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Responde nt	Comme nt	
1572	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1572	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1573	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1573	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1573	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1573	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1573	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1573	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1573	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1573	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1573	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1573	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1573	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1573	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1573	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1573	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1573	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1573	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1573	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1573	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1573	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1573	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1574	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1574	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1574	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1574	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1574	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1574	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1574	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1574	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1574	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1574	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1574	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1574	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1574	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1574	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1574	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1574	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1574	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1574	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1574	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1574	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1575	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1575	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1575	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1575	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1575	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1575	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1575	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1575	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1575	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1575	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1575	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1575	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1575	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1575	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1575	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1575	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1575	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1575	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1575	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1575	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1576	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1576	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1576	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1576	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1576	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1576	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1576	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1576	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1576	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1576	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1576	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1576	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1576	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1576	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1576	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1576	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1576	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1576	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1576	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1576	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1577	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1577	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1577	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1577	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1577	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1577	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1577	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1577	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1577	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1577	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1577	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1577	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1577	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1577	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1577	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1577	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1577	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1577	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1577	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1577	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1578	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1578	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1578	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1578	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1578	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1578	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1578	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1578	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1578	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1578	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1578	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1578	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1578	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1578	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1578	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1578	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1578	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1578	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1578	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1578	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1579	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1579	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1579	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1579	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1579	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1579	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1579	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1579	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1579	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1579	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1579	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1579	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1579	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1579	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1579	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1579	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1579	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1579	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1579	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1579	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1580	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1580	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1580	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1580	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1580	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1580	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1580	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1580	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1580	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1580	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1580	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1580	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1580	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1580	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1580	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1580	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1580	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1580	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1580	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1580	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1581	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1581	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1581	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1581	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1581	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1581	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1581	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1581	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1581	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1581	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1581	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1581	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1581	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1581	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1581	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1581	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1581	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1581	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1581	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1581	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1582	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1582	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1582	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1582	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1582	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1582	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1582	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1582	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1582	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1582	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1582	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1582	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1582	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1582	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1582	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1582	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1582	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1582	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1582	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1582	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1583	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
1583	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1583	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1583	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1583	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1583	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1583	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1583	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1583	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1583	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1583	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1583	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1583	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1583	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1583	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1583	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1583	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1583	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1583	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1583	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1584	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1584	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1584	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1584	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1584	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1584	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1584	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1584	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1584	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1584	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1584	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1584	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1584	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1584	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1584	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1584	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1584	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1584	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1584	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1584	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1585	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1585	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1585	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1585	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1585	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1585	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1585	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1585	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1585	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1585	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1585	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1585	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1585	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1585	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1585	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1585	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1585	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1585	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1585	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1585	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1586	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1586	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1586	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1586	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1586	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1586	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1586	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1586	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1586	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1586	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1586	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1586	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1586	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1586	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1586	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1586	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1586	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1586	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1586	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1586	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1587	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1587	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1587	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1587	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1587	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1587	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1587	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1587	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1587	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1587	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1587	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1587	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1587	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1587	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1587	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1587	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1587	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1587	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1587	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1587	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1588	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1588	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1588	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1588	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1588	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1588	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1588	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1588	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1588	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1588	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1588	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1588	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1588	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1588	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1588	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1588	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1588	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1588	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1588	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1588	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1589	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1589	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1589	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1589	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1589	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1589	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1589	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1589	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1589	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1589	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1589	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1589	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1589	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1589	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1589	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1589	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1589	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1589	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1589	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1589	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1590	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1590	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1590	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1590	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1590	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1590	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1590	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1590	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1590	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1590	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1590	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1590	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1590	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1590	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1590	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1590	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1590	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1590	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1590	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1590	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1591	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1591	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1591	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1591	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1591	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1591	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1591	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1591	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1591	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1591	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1591	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1591	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1591	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1591	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1591	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1591	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1591	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1591	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1591	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1591	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1592	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1592	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1592	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1592	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1592	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1592	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1592	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1592	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1592	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1592	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1592	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1592	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1592	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1592	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1592	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1592	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1592	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1592	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1592	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1592	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1593	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1593	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1593	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1593	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1593	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1593	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1593	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1593	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1593	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1593	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1593	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1593	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1593	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1593	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1593	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1593	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1593	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1593	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1593	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1593	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1594	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1594	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1594	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1594	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1594	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1594	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1594	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1594	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1594	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1594	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1594	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1594	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1594	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1594	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1594	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1594	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1594	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1594	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1594	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1594	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1595	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1595	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1595	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1595	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1595	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1595	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1595	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1595	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1595	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1595	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1595	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1595	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1595	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1595	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1595	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1595	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1595	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1595	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1595	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1595	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1596	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1596	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1596	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1596	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1596	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1596	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1596	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1596	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1596	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1596	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1596	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1596	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1596	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1596	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1596	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1596	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1596	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1596	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1596	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1596	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1597	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1597	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1597	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1597	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1597	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1597	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1597	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1597	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1597	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1597	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1597	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1597	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1597	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1597	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1597	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1597	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1597	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1597	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1597	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1597	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1598	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1598	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1598	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1598	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1598	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1598	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1598	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1598	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1598	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1598	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1598	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1598	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1598	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1598	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1598	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1598	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1598	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1598	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1598	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1598	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1599	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
1599	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1599	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1599	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1599	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1599	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1599	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1599	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1599	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1599	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1599	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1599	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1599	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1599	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1599	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1599	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1599	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1599	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1599	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1599	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1600	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1600	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1600	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1600	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1600	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1600	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1600	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1600	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1600	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1600	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1600	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1600	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1600	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1600	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1600	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1600	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1600	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1600	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1600	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1600	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1601	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1601	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1601	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1601	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1601	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1601	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1601	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1601	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1601	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1601	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1601	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1601	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1601	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1601	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1601	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1601	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1601	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1601	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1601	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1601	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1602	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1602	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1602	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1602	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1602	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1602	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1602	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1602	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1602	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1602	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1602	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1602	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1602	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1602	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1602	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1602	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1602	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1602	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1602	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1602	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1603	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1603	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1603	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1603	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1603	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1603	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1603	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1603	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1603	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1603	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1603	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1603	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1603	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1603	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1603	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1603	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1603	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1603	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1603	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1603	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1604	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1604	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1604	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1604	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1604	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1604	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1604	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1604	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1604	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1604	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1604	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1604	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1604	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1604	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1604	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1604	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1604	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1604	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Response number	Comment	
1604	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1604	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1605	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1605	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1605	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1605	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1605	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1605	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1605	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1605	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1605	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1605	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1605	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1605	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1605	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1605	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1605	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1605	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1605	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1605	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1605	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1605	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1606	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1606	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1606	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1606	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1606	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1606	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1606	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1606	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1606	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1606	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1606	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1606	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1606	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1606	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1606	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1606	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1606	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1606	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1606	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1606	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1607	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1607	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1607	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1607	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1607	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1607	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1607	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1607	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1607	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1607	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1607	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1607	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1607	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1607	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1607	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1607	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1607	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1607	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1607	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1607	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1608	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1608	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1608	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1608	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1608	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1608	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1608	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1608	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1608	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1608	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1608	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1608	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1608	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1608	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1608	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1608	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1608	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1608	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1608	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1608	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1609	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1609	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1609	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1609	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1609	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1609	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1609	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1609	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1609	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1609	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1609	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1609	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1609	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1609	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1609	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1609	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1609	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1609	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1609	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1609	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1610	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1610	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1610	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1610	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1610	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1610	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1610	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1610	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1610	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1610	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1610	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1610	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1610	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1610	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1610	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1610	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1610	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1610	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1610	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1610	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1611	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1611	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1611	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1611	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1611	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1611	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1611	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1611	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1611	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1611	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1611	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1611	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1611	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1611	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1611	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1611	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1611	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1611	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1611	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1611	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1612	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1612	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1612	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1612	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1612	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1612	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1612	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1612	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1612	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1612	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1612	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1612	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1612	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1612	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1612	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1612	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1612	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1612	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1612	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1612	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1613	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1613	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1613	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1613	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1613	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1613	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1613	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1613	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1613	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1613	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1613	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1613	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1613	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1613	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1613	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1613	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1613	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1613	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1613	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1613	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1614	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1614	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1614	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1614	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1614	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1614	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1614	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1614	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1614	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1614	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1614	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1614	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1614	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1614	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1614	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1614	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1614	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1614	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1614	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1614	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1615	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1615	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1615	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1615	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1615	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1615	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1615	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1615	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1615	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1615	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1615	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1615	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1615	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1615	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1615	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1615	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1615	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1615	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1615	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1615	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1616	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1616	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1616	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1616	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1616	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1616	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1616	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1616	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1616	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1616	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1616	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1616	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1616	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1616	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1616	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1616	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1616	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1616	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1616	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1616	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1617	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1617	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1617	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1617	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1617	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1617	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1617	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1617	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1617	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1617	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1617	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1617	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1617	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1617	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1617	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1617	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1617	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1617	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1617	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1617	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1618	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1618	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1618	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1618	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1618	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1618	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1618	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1618	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1618	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1618	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1618	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1618	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1618	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1618	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1618	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1618	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1618	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1618	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1618	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1618	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1619	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1619	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1619	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1619	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1619	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1619	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1619	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1619	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1619	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1619	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1619	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1619	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1619	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1619	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1619	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1619	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1619	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1619	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1619	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1619	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1620	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1620	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1620	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1620	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1620	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1620	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1620	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1620	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1620	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1620	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1620	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1620	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1620	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1620	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1620	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1620	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1620	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1620	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1620	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1620	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1621	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1621	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1621	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1621	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1621	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1621	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1621	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1621	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1621	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1621	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1621	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1621	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1621	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1621	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1621	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1621	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1621	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1621	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1621	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1621	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1622	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1622	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1622	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1622	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1622	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1622	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1622	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1622	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1622	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1622	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1622	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1622	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1622	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1622	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1622	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1622	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1622	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1622	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1622	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1622	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1623	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1623	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1623	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1623	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1623	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1623	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1623	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1623	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1623	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1623	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1623	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1623	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1623	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1623	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1623	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1623	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1623	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1623	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1623	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1623	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1624	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1624	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1624	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1624	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1624	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1624	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1624	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1624	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1624	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1624	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1624	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1624	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1624	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1624	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1624	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1624	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1624	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1624	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1624	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1624	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1625	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1625	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1625	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1625	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1625	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1625	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1625	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1625	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1625	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1625	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1625	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1625	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1625	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1625	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1625	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1625	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1625	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1625	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1625	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1625	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1626	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1626	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1626	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1626	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1626	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1626	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1626	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1626	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1626	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1626	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1626	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1626	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1626	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1626	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1626	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1626	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1626	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1626	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1626	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1626	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1627	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1627	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1627	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1627	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1627	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1627	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1627	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1627	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1627	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1627	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1627	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1627	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1627	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1627	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1627	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1627	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1627	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1627	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1627	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1627	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1628	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1628	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1628	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1628	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1628	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1628	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1628	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1628	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1628	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1628	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1628	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1628	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1628	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1628	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1628	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1628	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1628	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1628	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1628	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1628	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1629	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1629	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1629	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1629	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1629	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1629	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1629	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1629	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1629	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1629	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1629	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1629	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1629	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1629	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1629	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1629	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1629	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1629	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1629	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1629	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1630	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1630	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1630	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1630	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1630	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1630	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1630	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1630	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1630	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1630	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1630	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1630	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1630	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1630	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1630	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1630	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1630	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1630	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1630	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1630	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1631	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1631	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1631	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1631	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1631	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1631	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1631	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1631	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1631	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1631	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1631	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1631	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1631	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1631	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1631	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1631	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1631	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1631	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1631	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1631	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1632	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1632	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1632	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1632	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1632	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1632	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1632	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1632	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1632	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		
Respondent	Comment	Answer
1632	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1632	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1632	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1632	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1632	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1632	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1632	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1632	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1632	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1632	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1632	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1633	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1633	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1633	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1633	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1633	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1633	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1633	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1633	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1633	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1633	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1633	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1633	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1633	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1633	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1633	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1633	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1633	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1633	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1633	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1633	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1634	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1634	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1634	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1634	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1634	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1634	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1634	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1634	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1634	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1634	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1634	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1634	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1634	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1634	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1634	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1634	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1634	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1634	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1634	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1634	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1635	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1635	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1635	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1635	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1635	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1635	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1635	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1635	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1635	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1635	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1635	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1635	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1635	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1635	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1635	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1635	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1635	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1635	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1635	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1635	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1636	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1636	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1636	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1636	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1636	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1636	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1636	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1636	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1636	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1636	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1636	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1636	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1636	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1636	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1636	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1636	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1636	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1636	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1636	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1636	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1637	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1637	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1637	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1637	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1637	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1637	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1637	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1637	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1637	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1637	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1637	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1637	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1637	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1637	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1637	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1637	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1637	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1637	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1637	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1637	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1638	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1638	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1638	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1638	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1638	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1638	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1638	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1638	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1638	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1638	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1638	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1638	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1638	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1638	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1638	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1638	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1638	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1638	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1638	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1638	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1639	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1639	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1639	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1639	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1639	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1639	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1639	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1639	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1639	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1639	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1639	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1639	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1639	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1639	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1639	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1639	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1639	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1639	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1639	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1639	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1640	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1640	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1640	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1640	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1640	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1640	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1640	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1640	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1640	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1640	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1640	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1640	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1640	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1640	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1640	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1640	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1640	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1640	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1640	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1640	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1641	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1641	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1641	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1641	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1641	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1641	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1641	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1641	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1641	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1641	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1641	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1641	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1641	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1641	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1641	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1641	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1641	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1641	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1641	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1641	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1642	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1642	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1642	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1642	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1642	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1642	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1642	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1642	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1642	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1642	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1642	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1642	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1642	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1642	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1642	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1642	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1642	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1642	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1642	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1642	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station
1643	1	I do not support the above sites being allocated for any type of development. 1) Both the above sites are outside the original 2010 Planning Boundaries agreed by the Council and approved by the Independent Government Inspector
1643	2	Independent Government Inspector, who also in his reply stated Greenfield sites should only be considered as a last resort: Take these out of the plan and you are still left with space for 3500 houses which is double the requirement needed
1643	3	2) Both above sites at present have no access. Any access would involve a major road junction or roundabout to be configured to allow the proposed new traffic
1643	4	This could only be built at the bottom of the dip with Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road and traffic coming from town at present cannot be easily seen from the present intersection. Blyth Road itself currently is not conducive to more traffic; it is not edged, is very dark due to trees and needs constant attention to drainage and pot holes. It is also an accident black spot area with many fatalities.
1643	5	3) Site 4/W9 large copse of trees in the middle and it has been established that many have Protection Orders.
1643	6	During the last month a copse and pond have been removed and filled in. Prior to this there was an active bird population with at least 12 varieties of birds regularly as well as small flocks of migrating birds. At present this has been reduced greatly and would totally disappear with the removal of the copse. This has obviously impacted on the ecology already and to reduce good quality farm land and destroy existing trees will make this worse and destroy the landscape.
1643	7	4) In terms of the usage of the land to build up to 3500 houses on the two sites would add to a large housing area and produce what would be only described as an 'Urban Sprawl', which would completely unbalance the population of Worksop
1643	8	In my opinion would be on the wrong side of Worksop in terms of employment opportunities.
1643	9	At the same time site 39/W10 is now regarded as a public amenity and any day of the week is busy with adults and children pursuing all sorts of activities from hang gliding, golf, football, general play and provides areas for dog walking. Also major fairs and events are frequently held as well as football facilities.
1643	10	5) You will also appreciate that there is no infrastructure at present on these Greenfield sites. For sites of this size a major cost factor would be incurred. A major access would be required and difficulties would be encountered locating this to ensure public safety.
1643	11	At present time the water supply in the estate next to site 4/W9 has to be flushed frequently to clear the build up of sediment and chlorine.
1643	12	At the same time the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Thievesdale Lane is regularly pumped out by tankers because it cannot cope on its own.
1643	13	Finally the BT unit is not adequate to supply a good quality broadband service and would need major upgrading.
1643	14	6) It would appear that the surface water, sewerage is not adequate to cope as in the past several years mud and water has flowed down the field in the site 4/W9 and flooded houses on Colsterdale which have been the subject of insurance claims. Any development of the site with hard surfaces would exacerbate this and lead to the bottom road junction being flooded. More so now that the pond has been filled with rubbish and covered over.
1643	15	7) Finally the impact on public visual amenity would be devastating. Woodland, Greenfield and amenity land would be lost under overlarge urban sprawl; this surely does not enhance the quality of life in Worksop as a whole.
1643	16	Add to this the increase level of traffic which has to go through the town to shop and to work as well as school runs (none in the area to cope with additional children)
1643	17	Also the need for further medical facilities
1643	18	Criteria 4: this cannot be used until Grade Category is defined: Cannot be lumped together for convenience.
1643	19	Criteria 3: Can only-answered this question therefore has no validity. All sites will get the same score
1643	20	Criteria 2: To wide a question, invariably answer will be G. Needs refining, the only way 'R' would be the answer is if you plan development of say a 'Nuclear Power Station

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1644	1	Notwithstanding the stated intention not to rank sites and the subsequent comments regarding the need to take account of mitigation measures, the application of the criteria based methodology still assumes that all criteria are equal (or all green scores are equal). This should not be the case, as the deliverability of a site will be impacted to a differing degree by each of the criteria. For example, compatibility of neighbouring uses will have a greater potential impact on the development of a site, than whether or not the site results in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, particularly in an area where the competing greenfield sites will be broadly comparable. In these circumstances, It IS considered that the application of a criteria based approach will result in a spurious degree of accuracy, inappropriate to the selection process to be undertaken. One of the results of a criteria based approach is reflected in paragraph 2.17 of the Issues and Options Paper, which states that 'there may well be several sites in a settlement with the same 'score', in which case it will come down to a matter of judgement as to which are the most suitable, taking particular note of local opinion. It is therefore essential for the scoring process to be adjusted accordingly. We provide specific comments on each of the proposed criterion below:
1644	2	While the importance of community engagement, particularly in the context of the emerging "localism" agenda, is recognised, it is considered that this criterion is too subjective and cannot be fairly measured. LIH has particular concerns relating to: The definition of the community. This is particularly important for sites within and adjoining Worksop which has no parish/town council; frequently the starting point for developers and landowners wishing to identify, not only the key issues in a community, but also the key players. Without such an elected body, it is more difficult to identify the community to be engaged with. In so saying it is acknowledged that there may be a Residents Association or Action Group (frequently established to oppose the development being promoted) but these tend to be single issue groups which may discourage other parties, with legitimate views, being heard
1644	3	The definition of strong community support. On the basis that, say, 75% of the local community support the development does this mean that 75% of those who have engaged in the consultation process or 75% of the local residents? If the latter, how wide a catchment is drawn to determine the extent of the local community? These questions might be regarded as rather extreme but they make the point that without clearer guidance it is very difficult to classify the level of community support, in the manner set out in paragraph 2.25. As discussed with the Council, LIH is intending to undertake its own community engagement once the Council's consultation process has been completed.
1644	4	At this stage of the process LIH consider that this criterion should be deleted and included at a later date when all involved parties have had an opportunity to consult with the local communities about the details of each individual scheme.
1644	5	This is an important criterion to be taken into account when assessing a site's suitability for development because of the potential impact of noise, odour, light and/or privacy on the amenities of residential properties. Such considerations will also have an impact upon the deliverability of new housing as prospective purchasers are frequently deterred from living close to un-neighbourly uses. In this context, it is noted that a number of sites which are identified as potential housing or mixed use sites are located either adjacent to or within the vicinity of industrial uses and therefore issues of incompatibility are likely to be raised. Given the importance of ensuring compatible neighbouring uses for residential development, it is considered that greater weight should be placed on this criterion when considering the suitability of housing allocations. This criterion also needs to be applied when assessing the suitability of sites for a mix of uses as expanded upon in response to Question 5
1644	6	In assessing this criterion, it is important to recognise that job opportunities can and will be provided as part of a development, even if they are not classified as an employment (i.e. a B use) land use. For example the primary school and community facilities, to be provided as part of the residential development, will employ a significant number of people. Furthermore, the construction industry is one of the UK's largest employment sectors but is frequently not recognised as such because the jobs which it provides are transitory. Even so, comparatively large sites are likely to be developed over several years, providing a continuous supply of jobs over this period and therefore making an important contribution to the local economy; a point which was recognised in the Government's Plan for Growth which states, at paragraph 2.283, that "A successful construction industry is vital for sustainable growth. It is recognised that jobs in the construction industry are not always taken by local people. In order to address this issue, obligations with the Council can be entered into to ensure that local people can have priority access to those jobs associated with the site's construction. Similarly, on-site training schemes for young, unemployed people can be facilitated. It is therefore requested that in assessing a development's compliance with Criterion 3 all on-site job opportunities are positively assessed.
1644	7	It is considered that this criterion is too narrow. The Agricultural Land Classification system assesses the quality of agricultural land which should be taken into account alongside other sustainability considerations, namely those stipulated in paragraph 28 of PPS7: biodiversity; the quality and character of the landscape; its amenity value or heritage interest; accessibility to infrastructure, workforce and markets; maintaining viable communities; and the protection of natural resources, including soil quality. Although some of these criteria (Landscape Character and Green Infrastructure) are included within the Site Assessment Criteria, most of these considerations are not. It is therefore considered that Criterion 4 should be amended to enable the assessment of a wider range of sustainability criteria which would be enabled by amending the wording of Criterion 4 to state: How will any adverse effects on the environment be minimised? The scoring of this criterion would then need to be amended to state: No impact and/or appropriate mitigation measures can be incorporated some impact and/or some mitigation measures can be incorporated No measures can be incorporated to mitigate impact
1644	8	In view of the importance of water quality, LIH support this criterion

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1644	9	The Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) indicates a landscape sensitivity varying between low, moderate or high for each of the Landscape Zones within which the SHLAA sites are located. The zones cover broad areas that extend beyond the proposed SHLAA site boundaries and therefore the Bassetlaw Lea can only be used as a baseline reference to provide a general indication of the landscape character context for each site. The Bassetlaw LCA does not identify the specific landscape features present on individual sites nor does it set out the relationship between each site and any nearby identified landscape features. Therefore we consider that the question 'will the site impact negatively on landscape character' cannot be answered simply by considering in which broad category ('create', 'restore or reinforce' or 'conserve ') the site falls. Specific questions should be asked relating to the existing visual containment of the site, its landscape structure, its relationship to the settlement edge and remainder of the character zone and whether there is scope to protect and enhance the existing landscape features with development. For instance Zones ML06 and ML07 are identified as being in the 'conserve' category. However, the large woodland blocks that define Site 35 would ensure that appropriately designed development was very well contained thus significantly limiting the landscape effects on the wider landscape. In contrast, for Zone SH37 'res/ore' is proposed within the Bassetlaw Lea as in this location the historic landscape structure has been eroded by intensive arable farming. However the lack of landscape structure often results in a visually exposed landscape where development may have far reaching negative impacts on an open countryside context, with many years needed for any associated new structural planting to mature. A golf course currently contains the eastern edge of Work sop and development in this location (Site 4) would leapfrog this green edge into open countryside. It is therefore requested that Criterion 6 is reworded to provide a fairer assessment of landscape character on a site-by site basis as it currently does not present a balanced assessment of landscape character in terms of development capacity. A site specific assessment that considers each of the SHLAA sites in turn, using the Bassetlaw Lea to inform each assessment would be a more realistic, fair and robust approach to this question. The suggested rewording for Criterion 6 is: Heading: What impact will development have on Landscape Character? Development will not have significant negative impact on Character: Development impacts on Landscape Character and can be satisfactorily mitigated A Development will have significant negative impact on Landscape Character and / or any negative impacts cannot be satisfactorily mitigated
1644	10	LIH seeks clarification on how this criterion will be applied to greenfield sites
1644	11	Within this criterion, it should be recognised that the development of greenfield sites can enhance existing Green Infrastructure by improving accessibility to open spaces
1644	12	As noted in paragraph 2.39 of the Consultation Paper, any constraints will have been assessed as part of the SHLAA process. As the wording of this criterion is too broad to be used as a meaningful measure of assessment for a site's suitability, it is considered that reference needs to be made to the SHLAA's findings. This is particularly important as there could be some constraints which cannot be resolved whilst, as indicated on the SHLAA forms, others may be resolvable by the incorporation of negotiated mitigation measures. [n these circumstances, it would be inappropriate to weigh all unresolved constraints equally. Further, if a site's constraints have been resolved or are resolvable subject to the imposition of conditions, it should be assessed on the same basis as a site with no constraints
1644	13	Access and transport issues are such important considerations when determining a site's suitability for development that, at the very least, they merit a specific reference within Criterion 9; in this way it will be possible to take account of sustainable transport measures and the likely modal shift which will arise
1644	14	Yes, Lands Improvement Holdings (LIH) believes that Worksop should be allocated more homes than provided for in the (adopted) Core Strategy. For clarification purposes, it does not accept that there is the same justification for additional employment land. At the Core Strategy Examination held in May 20 11, it was argued, on behalf of LIH that as Worksop was the District's principal town and the only designated Sub Regional Centre, it should be accommodating 40% of the District's housing requirement rather than the 32% proposed. However, LIH is aware that having examined the evidence, the Inspector concluded that the plan's apportionment was justified. He continued by stating, in paragraph 38 of his report, that although "the town could accommodate more growth this would require commensurate reductions at Retford and/or Harworth Bircotes" and III his opinion there were insufficient grounds for advocating such a redistribution. In the circumstances described, it is not considered that there is scope for more housing to be allocated than required by the Core Strategy, if the Site Allocations DPD is to remain in general conformity with it. However, there is a separate issue which may necessitate a greater number of housing allocations than actually required; namely, the need to acknowledge that the housing requirement is a minimum figure and to ensure that the requisite number of dwellings is delivered during the plan period. As the Inspector indicated in paragraph 23 of his report, "Experience would suggest that not all committed sites are likely to come forward for development and (that) this needs to be factored into any calculations". This approach is advocated in the draft National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 109, where it is stipulated that in order to boost the supply of housing, local planning authorities should "include within the supply of specific deliverable housing sites all additional allowance of at least 20 per cent to ensure choice and competition in the market for land". The definition of "deliverable" is also pertinent to the consideration of this issue in that it stipulates that for sites to be deliverable they should not only be available now but there should be "a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years". In the circumstances pertaining to Bassetlaw, there is one very significant site -Harworth Colliery -which is the subject of an outline planning permission for up to 996 residential units and yet the application(s) for the approval of Reserved Matters do not have to be made "until the expiration fifteen years" from the date of the permission (i.e. by 29 March 2026) which is only two years from the end of the plan period. On this basis it is quite possible that none of the permitted dwellings at Harworth Colliery will be implemented within the plan period and as a consequence there is a real danger that the number of outstanding commitments will be over-stated as a result of which the amount of land which needs to be allocated to meet the District's housing requirement over the plan period will be under-stated. There will be other examples, albeit of a lesser scale throughout the district and it is therefore considered that a lapse rate of non-implementation allowance of 20% needs to be applied to the residual housing requirement in the manner shows below. In summary, it is considered essential when determining the amount of land to be allocated for housing to include an allowance for those committed sites/dwellings which will not be completed within the plan period for a variety of reasons. The application of a 20% non-implementation allowance to the residual housing requirement will necessitate the allocation of a further 1,200 dwellings approximately across the District of which 378 will need to be provided at Worksop

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1644	15	Site 35, the land to the north of Gateford, should be allocated for residential development. In responding to this question and providing the justification for the site's allocation, each of the Site Assessment Criteria set out within the Issues and Options Consultation Paper has been considered, as follows:
1644	16	As discussed with the Council, LIH will be commencing its community engagement in 2012 which will be informed by the responses received to the consultation on the Issues and Options paper. In the meantime, L1H has engaged Political Developments to inform future community and political consultation, as well as the strategy for community engagement as both the Plan and LIH's proposals progress. It is therefore too early in the process to provide any indication of the degree of community support for the site's development. As outlined in response to Question I above, it is requested that this criterion is deleted as it does not provide for a fair and balanced assessment of competing sites, which are all at different stages of the planning process.
1644	17	L1H does want to take the opportunity provided by the Council to highlight the benefits which the development of the land north of Gateford would be able to offer the local community. The principal benefits can be summarised as: A new primary school; A community hall and meeting room; Scope for the expansion of GP facilities; and, A comprehensive "Green Infrastructure" framework accommodating recreational and other amenity facilities including a Community Allotments area and trim trail all within publicly accessible open space. The range of benefits and the juxtaposition of uses are shown on the indicative masterplan drawing which accompanies this representation; details of which are described in the relevant sections of text below.
1644	18	Yes; the site to the north of Gateford would be developed for residential purposes, with associated services and facilities. It adjoins the residential estate known as Gateford Park and therefore these uses are compatible.
1644	19	A further factor when considering compatibility is that when the existing housing at Gateford was developed, it was approved with no community facilities apart from a tightly constrained primary school site. As part of the development now being promoted as a housing allocation, it is proposed to provide a community hub incorporating a (site for a) primary school (with scope to provide dual use to enable the local community to use the hall and meeting rooms, as well as the outdoor sports pitches). Space would also be provided to enable a GP 's surgery to be built, if required. This would be provided close to the entrance of the development, as shown on the masterplan accompanying this submission. This location would enable the new community facilities to be easily accessible to both the new and existing communities which will greatly assist the assimilation of the two communities to form a sustainable urban extension
1644	20	The land north of Gateford is also compatible with the Gateford Conservation Area which covers the western most field within the site being promoted. As can be seen from the accompanying masterplan, it is proposed that this field, currently used for arable purposes, should be used for informal open space which will enhance and protect the character of the area. This is a key element of the integrated Green Infrastructure package
1644	21	A further neighbouring use, which has been taken into account in the formulation of the proposals for the land north of Gateford, is the adjoining woodlands which are designated Nature Conservation Areas due to the notable flora that their habitats support. To establish the importance and sensitivity of the ecological interest an Ecological Assessment was undertaken by FPCR to inform the indicative site masterplan. In order to minimise any potential impact from the development on these sensitive woodland habitats, the ecological appraisal recommends the following measures which are shown on the masterplan and incorporated in the Green Infrastructure framework: A buffer of green space with a minimum width of 20m between the development and the designated sites. Reinforcement of the boundary with the SINC / Ancient Woodland sites, in the form of additional planting to bolster existing gaps in the boundary hedgerow and the provision of appropriate fencing. Although the existing formal footpaths are retained, no additional external footpaths have been provided. However, a very comprehensive network of new footpaths and cycleways can be provided by the Green Infrastructure which encompasses the development
1644	22	The site will generate approximately 650-700 new households. The new residential population will generate new economic opportunities by increasing household spending in the local centres, as well as providing a number of jobs during the housing development phase and as part of the community facility school
1644	23	In addition, LIH is willing and able to enter into a legal obligation with the Council to enable jobs associated with the construction of the site's development to be made available in the first instance to suitable local applicants. Similarly, on-site training schemes for young unemployed people will be facilitated as part of the development
1644	24	Furthermore, the development of the site will result in an increase to the local population, which will have a beneficial impact on Bassetlaw District's annual Council Tax receipts.
1644	25	In response to Question 1 above, it has been suggested that this criterion is amended, to address a wider range of sustainability criteria and the means by which any adverse effects on the environment can be minimised. The criteria to be addressed are: biodiversity; the quality and character of the landscape; its amenity value or heritage interest; accessibility to infrastructure, workforce and markets; maintaining viable communities; and the protection of natural resources, including soil quality.
1644	26	Insofar as the agricultural land issue is concerned, the land to the north of Worksop is classified as Grade 3 agricultural land on the Defra plans
1644	27	None of the area to be developed, as shown on the accompanying plan, is within the Water Source Protection Zone, as defined by the Environment Agency. The southern extremity of the field on the western part of the site is within the Water Source Protection Zone 3; however LIH has already accepted that no development would be appropriate on this part of the site because of its inclusion in the designated Conservation Area and consequently the proposed development will neither be in a Source Protection Zone, nor have an impact on it. This classification is in contrast to the majority of other sites adjoining Worksop suggested for either residential or mixed use development and which are either in Zones 2 or 3.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1644	28	No, as confirmed by reference to the Landscape and Visual Appraisal prepared by FPCR in January 2010; a copy of which has previously been provided to the Council. For ease of reference, extracts from its findings and conclusions are set out below: The landscape character of both the wider and local landscape is contrasting and includes both urban edge uses and influences and arable farmland The site has the landscape capacity to accommodate significant yet well planned and appropriate change. The scattering of historic buildings within their landscape setting to the south west of the site, identified as the Old Gateford Conservation Area, have been assessed as high landscape sensitivity... .. The western .field within the site visually connects to the conservation area only by virtue of the lane. Appropriate landscape treatment to the western field, within the Masterplan proposals for the development, should bring landscape benefits to the Conservation Area. Visually the site is well contained to views from the rural area The two public rights of way within the site currently have open views across the site to the urban edge. Views from the Gateford residential area are limited to properties on the settlement edge that overlook the site and to more elevated properties, where the development would be seen within the context of the existing residential area. The only view identified from the Old Gateford Consen1ation Area is .from the lane leading to the Gateford Hill House residential care home, this view is across the western .field; the site area proposed for development being hidden view by the undulating landform. Overall, the proposed development would initially result in slight visually adverse impacts on the identified receptors. The introduction of the Green Infrastructure and sensitive Masterplan design would result in minimal impacts at year 1, with potential visual benefits approaching year 15 with the maturing and management of the landscape proposals. In landscape and visual terms, the proposed development would not result in any significant adverse effects on the existing landscape character of the site. In/act, the proposals would result in some localised benefits that should be maximised through the implementation and subsequent management of a comprehensive package of landscape and planting. It is considered that there would be no material or adverse effects on the Old Gateford Conservation Area designation. Sympathetic design proposals with consideration of the scale, character and density of the proposed development in the context of the landscape, visual and related issues should enable new built development to form a logical extension to the existing adjacent housing area and be in keeping with local and regional planning policy
1644	29	However, it should be noted that Landscape Character, as addressed in the appraisal is not the same as determine which of the Landscape Character Zones the site is within; the issue to be addressed in Criterion 6. The land north of Gateford is split between Zones ML06 (Carlton in Lindrick) and ML07 (Old Gateford Conservation Area) which are described as having 'moderate' and 'high' sensitivity respectively with the policy to 'conserve' for both. Recent residential development has already been undertaken within Zone ML07. Both zones cover a wide area with Zone ML06 extending northwards from the northern edge of Worksop to meet the southern edge of Carlton-in-Lindrick. The character descriptions identify the zones as having a high percentage of woodland cover (25% for Zone ML06) and acknowledge the visual containment provided by the woodland; "Views are generally limited to within the Policy Zone due to its wooded nature" (Zone ML06) and "Views into the Policy Zone ji-om both the 86041 and Owday Lane are limited by the landform which slopes away ji-om a central high point and woodland/plantation blocks. Southward views are defined by the urban fringes of Worksop" (Zone ML07).
1644	30	The assessment identifies key landscape actions for Zones ML06 and ML07. These don' l preclude development but instead set out the landscape considerations should development occur, such as; "Conserve the sparsely settled and rural character of the landscape by concentrating new development around the existing adjacent settlements of South Carton, Carlton-in-Lindrick and Worksop. Contain new development within existing field boundaries. Create woodland to contain and soften built development, preferably in advance new development
1644	31	The Bassetlaw LCA also sets out a series of Actions for conserving the existing landscape features including the setting to Gateford Hall. The FPCR landscape character assessment and Masterplan demonstrate that this is easily achievable by utilising and reinforcing the existing landscape structure of the site and wooded periphery within a robust Green Infrastructure to contain the development and enhance the current setting of Gateford Hall through the provision of a sensitively Designed Community Park to the north. In the case of Site 35 significant existing peripheral woodland already exists "to contain and soften built development ". In both cases, the site is in a "conserve" Landscape Character Zone and is therefore scored red. However, as stated in response to Question 1 above, it is considered that mitigation measures including environmental enhancements should be taken into account as part of the site assessment and site specific reviews undertaken on the landscape effects associated with individual developments contained within very board character areas.
1644	32	Proposed development north of Gateford (Site 35) would complement and enhance the local built settlement character rounding off the settlement edge in this location. The Masterplan proposals for the development demonstrate how the Gateford Conservation Area can be buffered and enhanced through provision of appropriate landscaping and how the existing Green Infrastructure can be extended through the Site to link the settlement edge to the existing Green Infrastructure assets of the surrounding woodland. The development proposals would be contained by the woodland within this settlement edge context. The detailed design of the built development and use of materials can be undertaken to reflect the best elements of local built form through preparation of a Design and Access Statement.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1644	33	A green infrastructure masterplan for Site 35 prepared by FPCR demonstrates that the existing landscape features on and adjacent to the site can be retained and enhanced whilst maintaining an appropriate buffer to protect and enhance the setting of Gateford Conservation Area, with the Community Park offering significant biodiversity and recreational amenity benefits. The Bassetlaw Green Infrastructure Study (May 2010) identifies existing 'District level green infrastructure features' and makes a number of recommendations which have been taken into account in the formulation of the Green Infrastructure masterplan for Site 35. The proposed Green Infrastructure (GI) will extend and link the existing GI features identified adjacent to the site, providing a network of linked green spaces for the new neighbourhood that would also bring wider settlement benefits. The green spaces from the adjacent residential estates link into the GI proposed for the site. At the eastern corner of the site new balancing facilities are proposed and will include wet meadow and tree planting and areas of open water for biodiversity benefit. From the eastern corner a broad landscape buffer to the adjacent woodland areas will wrap around the northern edge of the proposed development, providing informal recreational routes with additional trim trail health and fitness opportunities as well as a number of allotments. This buffer will link to the Community Park that is proposed for the western field within the site. A new Community Park will comprise grassland and new tree planting of parkland character and include informal recreational trails and will complement and enhance the setting of the Conservation Area and Gateford Park. A series of formal play areas are proposed throughout the Green Infrastructure areas proposed on site, and the exact locations of these would be agreed with Bassetlaw District Council. Within the proposed development area existing hedgerows will be retained, supplemented by avenues of formal tree planting, and these will provide green corridors subdividing the development. At the heart of the scheme a new multipurpose community school and playing fields are proposed as a key focal point. The existing rights of way that pass through the site are used to define the edge of the built development and will be retained within green corridors. These form part of the enhanced landscape setting provided by the wetland area to the east and Community Park to the west. The accessibility proposals within Site 35 would improve connections through the site to the rural rights of way network and to the identified GI Nodes for residents of Worksop via the new network of settlement edge recreation and biodiversity features that are proposed for the site. The proposals present a robust and carefully considered proposal to protect, extend and enhance local GI and contribute towards enhancing the connectivity and functionality of the existing Gr network at the northern edge of Worksop in accordance with the Bassetlaw Green Infrastructure Study.
1644	34	This question has been addressed, in the first instance, by reference to the 2010 SHLAA for the land north of Gateford (Site 35).
1644	35	There are three 'constraints' which have been resolved -listed building, conservation area and access -and three which continue to be 'identified' as potential constraints. Taking each of these potential constraints in turn, the following points are made in justification of their reclassification as resolved constraints. The SHLAA form identifies "An Area of Archaeology". An archaeological assessment of the land north of Gateford has been prepared by the University of Leicester Archaeological Services; a copy of which has previously been provided to the Council. This identified two areas within the site which are referred to in the Nottinghamshire HER; one a find spot for a Neolithic axe and the other a series of crop marks. Although, it is acknowledged that there is potential for the site to contain archaeological remains, they are likely to have suffered from some plough erosion as a result of the arable use of the fields. The County Archaeologist has considered the report and concurs that plough damage will be likely to have occurred. However, in the light of experience elsewhere, it is maintained that lower level archaeology, such as enclosure ditches, may be preserved and will require investigation. Discussions have been held with the County Archaeologist and it has been agreed that when a planning application is prepared, it will be informed by pre-determination work, undertaken in accordance with an agreed methodology statement. In the circumstances described, it should be recognised that the desk based assessment is sufficient to inform the allocations process and, consequently, "Archaeology" does not prevent the allocation of the site. It is therefore not a constraint to the development, as the requisite survey work will be undertaken in advance of a planning application's preparation. It is therefore requested that the Archaeology comments section on the SHLAA form is amended to state RESOLVED
1644	36	The SHLAA form identifies a "Biological SINC". An ecological assessment of the site was undertaken in September 2011, which considered the potential impact of any development on the Owday Wood, Owday Plantation, Nab's Ashes March, Nab's Ashes Plantation and Whipman Wood SINC sites, each of which has been designated on the basis of the notable flora that their habitats. This document accords with Policy DM9: Green Infrastructure; Biodiversity; Open Space and Sports Facilities from the adopted Bassetlaw Local Development Framework (LDF) which states: "Development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that they will not adversely affect or result in the loss of features of recognised importance not identified as part of the existing Green Infrastructure network " Although a copy of this ecological assessment has previously been provided to the Council, it is worth reiterating its findings as set out in paragraph 4.13 "The proposals for site design should therefore seek to minimise any potential impact to the sensitive SINC / Ancient Woodland habitats. This could involve a combination of the following: Maintenance of a buffer of green space between the development and the designated sites ; Reinforcement of the boundary with the SINC, Ancient Woodland sites. This could take the form of additional planting to bolster existing gaps in the boundary hedgerow and the provision of tall panel fencing. Ensuring that the creation of additional publically accessible footpaths is avoided, so that only existing formal footpaths are used. " Following an informal consultation Nottinghamshire County Council's Ecologist and Natural England have indicated that they are in general agreement with the recommendations of the ecological assessment. The size of the proposed site provides sufficient capacity to ensure that implementation of these recommendations (or similar) will ameliorate any potential impacts to the sensitive habitats of the SINC's I Ancient Woodland. It is therefore requested that the Ecology comments section on the SHLAA form is amended to state RESOLVED subject to the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures.
1644	37	Flood Risk -The SHLAA form notes that the "Site is identified as being within flood zone I"; the lowest flood risk zone and therefore not a constraint to development. The comments from the EA requiring a flood risk assessment are standard for any residential development of this size and type and are purely a means of securing a sustainable drainage system. LIH will commission the requisite assessment at the appropriate time. It is therefore requested that the Flood Risk comments section on the SHLAA form is amended to state RESOLVED subject to an FRA Overall, it is considered that there are no unresolved constraints relating to the site.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1644	38	In response to Question 1 above, it has been stated that access and transport issues are such important considerations when determining a site's suitability for development that, at the very least, they merit a specific reference within Criterion 9; in this way it will be possible to take account of sustainable transport measures and the likely modal shift which will arise. WSP has prepared a Position Paper to demonstrate the feasibility of the site's development in highways and transportation terms. This has been, undertaken by adopting a robust assessment methodology which has been agreed with the local highway authority. A copy of the report and accompanying appendices has been submitted to the Council. WSP has confirmed that there are no critical transport issues that would prevent the successful development of this site and any subsequent Transport Assessment will fully demonstrate this conclusion, with improvements / mitigation measures proposed as necessary. As the proposals continue WSP/LIH will continue to engage with highways to provide additional detail as required.
1644	39	It is not clear why the Council has limited this question to the mixed use sites rather than all of the sites which have been identified as potential development sites on Figure 4.1. The implication of this approach is that mixed use sites are to be considered in preference to single use sites, although some of the options put forward for the mixed use sites are for single uses and even where dual uses are shown for a site they do not appear to provide an integrated form of development; as a consequence they are comparable to single use sites within the locality of other uses. In the circumstances and in order to be fair and equitable it is considered that all potential development sites should be considered on the same basis.
1644	40	On 6 September 2011, detailed representations were submitted on behalf LIH to the Review of Bassetlaw District Council's Open Space Study. The opportunity presented by this consultation has been taken to reiterate that land adjacent to North Gateford access points should not be identified as open space
1644	41	LIH comments on the implications of the core strategy to the Review of the Open Space Study were: Core Strategy In submitting this representation, due consideration has been given to the background to the formulation of planning policy in respect of Public Open Space. In particular, LIH is aware that Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy, as proposed to be changed, in accordance with the Inspector's conclusions and recommendations, covers, inter alia, Green Infrastructure, Open Space and Sports Facilities and states: "Development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that they will not adversely affect or result in the loss of open spaces and sports facilities. Exceptions may be made if the open spaces or facilities are identified as surplus to demand in a given location and that alternative provision or a contribution towards new or improved facilities elsewhere would be preferable. "Further, the "protected open space" designations are to be removed from the Proposals Map.
1644	42	The implications of the Inspector's findings In paragraph 63 of his report, the Inspector referred to all of the open spaces and sports facilities within the District being identified on the Proposals Map. He continued by stating that: "It is accepted that there is a need to protect open space and sports facilities in general terms in the plan. However, the identification of specific areas for protection is best undertaken in tandem with the selection of sites for development as part of the preparation of the SA DPD. This will ensure that appropriate levels of provision for open space and sports facilities are made having regard to existing and proposed development. " In the circumstances, it was considered inappropriate to undertake the consultation on the sites to be assessed as part of the Review of Bassetlaw's Open Space Study, in advance of the assessment and subsequent selection of the sites to be allocated for development, unless it was subject to a clear caveat that a site's identification for assessment does not imply that it will be designated as Protected Open Space. Exactly the same considerations apply at the Issues and Options stage -decisions cannot be made on the protection of open space in advance of decisions on site allocations. If this caveat is not applied, it is a matter of particular concern to LIH that the land identified for assessment appears to be exactly the same as that which was shaded green on the submitted Proposals Map and denoted as "Protected Open Space" and therefore no regard has been had to the Inspector's clear direction and consequent changes.
1644	43	The additional or displaced growth should be directed to Worksop, the District's principal town, for the reasons given in response to Question 2 above.
1645	1	I can confirm that the above matter was discussed at a Parish Council meeting held 15.02.12 and there are no comments to put forward at this stage of the process, considering that the next review for the above Parishes will be in the year 2028.
1646	1	Bassetlaw introduction confirms that settlements specified as development locations were established at the Core Strategy Stage. This includes Rural Service Centres and yet the tone of much of this document is that residential allocations in Rural Service Centres should be reduced below the modest 10% already identified.
1646	2	Bassetlaw introduction continues the theme referring to the "limited amount of new development <i>required</i> in these areas". Judgements on the amount of development required in Rural Service Centres seems to have been the result of public consultation responses as opposed to a formal methodology (?) If correct, the word "required" is misleading. A range of facilities in Rural Service Centre Everton attract households from other settlements – school, sports facilities, pubs (x2), bridleways and woods indicating spare capacity.
1646	3	Why are residents of urban areas not asked what the appropriate level of development should be?
1646	4	Confirms that a range of sites submitted to the SHLAA have been disregarded because potential constraints numbered 1-19 cannot be overcome. The existence of Everton site 296 in the document indicates that it "may be suitable" however the effect of prejudicial questions referred to in the covering letter and the utilisation of those questions at Parish Council meeting 5.12.11 by BDC officers (see covering letter) to answer question 70, makes the reader question what has changed in the context of site 296 (and Rural Service Centre allocations in general), between the initial SHLAA screening programme and now? It is noted in the covering letter that the supporting evidence for promoting sites 296 and 453 as open space is "to be provided."
1646	5	This is unsatisfactory for 3 reasons: a) Without the open space supporting evidence, we as respondents cannot respond within the consultation period which closes 31st Jan 2012.
1646	6	b) Without open space supporting evidence, how was the open space judgement reached 5.12.11?
1646	7	c) Answers to prejudicial questions 67 and 68 could be used to support the open space argument (is this the "supporting evidence" currently awaited?) in which case the argument in favour of open space resulting from public consultation and reading of Parish Council minutes, will have been manufactured. Not only are questions 67 and 68 prejudicial but the responses for the consultation exercise will not be collated until early Feb – almost 2 months after the open space assertion was made at Parish Council by Richard Schofield and publicised on the Parish Council website.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1646	8	RS seeks to validate prejudicial questions 67 and 68 at that meeting by stating that “when residents completed questionnaires outlining their preferred number of new dwellings over the next 15 years, they would not have had in their mind sites with planning permission where development was not visibly apparent”. This is not a credible statement and disregards the 2 well-attended 2011 consultation events hosted by 296 site promoters where 12 new units were clearly identifiable. The statement also disregards the withdrawn 2009/10 application on site 296 prior to the current consultation where the number of new units was clearly shown and local consultation occurred through the statutory planning process with virtually no objections from local people. Furthermore, the Corner Farm site adjacent to site 296 can certainly be described as “visibly apparent”. It is located on the A631/ High Street Corner and comprises a number of 3 storey buildings. Everton is a low turnover, close knit, sociable village with over 26 individual clubs and societies – people ask about progress on the site regularly. Our assertion therefore is this: a) The “mean” 13 new unit number cited on page 89 is the number of new units Everton consultation respondents were prepared to accept over and above existing permissions. b) Any reduction in that number following the current consultation will be the result of prejudicial questions and availability of Parish Council minutes 5.12.11.
1646	9	Confirms that “The Council will clearly support suitable applications for economic development over the plan period.” This stance is welcomed since it clearly rectifies the omission outlined in Appendix B.
1646	10	Confirms methodology to be used for scoring employment sites. 1 and 2 scoring criteria are welcomed. Criteria 3 – is it more acceptable for residents in rural areas to travel to work in urban areas? There is a risk that this criteria could be too harshly implemented. There should instead be a new criteria around “ability of the site to provide local employment.”
1646	11	Reference to local opinion. Please see previous comments regarding prejudicial questions.
1646	12	Reiteration of Council support for economic development in Rural Service Centres. Good, thank you
1646	13	Level of local support – see previous comments ref: prejudicial questions
1646	14	Independent consultation held by Landowners. We have submitted our consultation responses to you, including raw data and not received acknowledgement
1646	15	Statement that independent consultation will not outweigh Council consultation processes. In view of what has occurred reference prejudicial questions, we expect this statement to be varied.
1646	16	Yes we agree with this criterion in the context of our own event and the BDC consultation event that occurred at Everton Village Hall November 2011
1646	17	Average of 13 new houses to 2028- Yes – probably plus site 453
1646	18	Small extensions and infill preferred to large extensions- Yes – probably plus site 453
1646	19	2 and 3 bed units plus bungalows preferred for open market- Yes – although bungalows unlikely in the Conservation area unless posing as cart shed. Shallow stair gradients with stair lift more likely
1646	20	Brownfield before Greenfield sites- Yes – site 296 is brown field farmyard
1646	21	Infrastructure concerns – school places, lack of post office or shop, lack of sewerage/drainage capacity. – no mention of traffic, congestion or parking issues. We are not aware of sewerage/drainage capacity issues but would consider reed bed if need be. School Places – State education is an internal market. Analysis of the school role will show children from a wide range of settlements containing primary schools travelling instead to Everton. My recollection is that the school did not appear to turn children away (?) but it is assumed that those living in the village of Everton are awarded preference? Certainly the 200m walk from site 296 is unlikely to necessitate the use of the car. In short, good historic results plus (historic) longer than average school day have been a winning combination for Everton School. Some families seeking to access grammar places at secondary school are known to purchase homes close to river Trent/Lincs (Walkeringham, Beckingham et al) and then “cast back” to Everton Primary for good results. When sitting entrance exam, those outside of County (Lincs) are assessed via distance from Gainsborough in addition to exam result if necessary ie: if 2 children sitting the entrance exam, pass, one lives in Everton, the other closer to the Trent/Lincs and there is a limit on places, the child closer to the Trent will have more chance of attaining a place. With more local children accessing, perhaps the school may limit the number of places available to those in villages with existing primary schools? If county deemed need for school extension, s106 contribution would be relevant. Shop – see later.
1646	22	Allotments desired thro CIL/S106- Yes - allotments could be provided through s106 along Mattersey Rd although it is believed that the Parish Council may have better sites and the land in question would be better as s106 cemetery extension.
1646	23	School Extension desired thro CIL/S106- See above. Not up to us and would depend on cost. What does County say?
1646	24	Additional Play facilities desired thro CIL/S106 - We believe this requirement may have been satisfied through new play park
1646	25	Doctors Surgery desired thro CIL/S106 - Limited opening hours of Gringley surgery indicate that this provision may not be sustainable. Not up to us but likely to be very expensive to fund even without revenue.
1646	26	Shop/Post Office desired through CIL/s106 - Yes – happy to look at cross-subsidising farm-shop. Situation with Mattersey Post Office and sustainability unclear.
1646	27	Employment creating jobs required to support new housing development - See criterion 3 below.
1646	28	Affordable First-time buyers homes - Yes – willing to look at 2 beds or retaining some equity in new units. Local Authority Mortgage Support could be applied if available. First buy may be extended.
1646	29	Sheltered accommodation for the elderly - Difficult. Have contacted McCarthy Stone plus others who have no appetite in rural areas. Issue of revenue support. Willing to look at it again.....perhaps electronic gadgetry would suffice if residents willing to consider service charge?

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1646	30	At the rear of the document pg138, the Council underlines the importance of consultation by stating: “Where there are a number of sites in an area with similar attributes and only one or two are needed, considerable weight will be given to local views as to which are the most appropriate sites for allocation.” The anticipated (and perhaps intended?) result of questions 67 and 68 and Parish Council minutes of 5.12.11, is that respondents will become more critical of sites 296.
1646	31	Yes we agree with this criterion
1646	32	Theoretically we agree with this criterion however we do not see how it can be implemented since landowners in Rural Service Centres have been prohibited from putting employment/mixed use sites forward earlier in the process (please see Appendix B). It leaves landowners in Rural Service Centres in something of a catch 22 whereby having been prohibited from putting employment/mixed use land forward, we are now being asked to demonstrate how our residential sites can bring forward economic development opportunities(?) In truth, viewed alongside flaws in the process identified in Appendix B, criterion 3 seems designed to undermine the notion of residential allocations in Rural Service Centres per se. Statements at 2.10 and 2.21 above go a long way in rectifying the situation however please see response at 2.11 reference requirement to demonstrate proximity to urban areas and variation proposed therein.
1646	33	Please note that in withdrawn application on site 296, two live/work units were incorporated and can be reinstated in any future application. Please note applicant intention for farm shop and visitor centre celebrating local heritage on Stonegate Farm, please note refused application on Stonegate Farm for rural diversification and employment data contained in design and access statement provided. Please note, Stonegate Farm site extends to 15 acres, with time extension, applicants can more comprehensively answer criterion 3 above.
1646	34	Yes we agree with this criterion
1646	35	Site 296/453 is unviable for agricultural production with 296 used as farmyard for many years. BDC have acknowledged this circumstance by altering the red line boundary of the village 2010/11 to take in the former crew yard to Corner Farm and by definition have acknowledged the obsolescence of the adjacent ground for cattle grazing.
1646	36	Explanation: having accepted the obsolescence of the built farmyard site (including cow sheds) in 2008 via planning approval on 19/07/00032, the red line boundary of the settlement never-the-less failed to take in the crew yard to the cow sheds – this was rectified in 2010/11. Since the crew yard was a function of a grassland beef-finishing system with site 296 comprising the grazing element of that process some 50 years ago; Bassetlaw planning has acknowledged the redundant nature of that land use.
1646	37	Yes we agree with this criterion.
1646	38	Site 296 will not impact on a water source protection zone.
1646	39	No we do not agree with this criterion in the context of Rural Service Centres on the basis that it encourages indulgent or “rose tinted” behaviours.
1646	40	The beef grassland finishing system referred to under criterion 4, having commenced 19 th century, was succeeded by commercial chicken sheds in the early 1960’s before “progressing” to farmyard extension/general dumping ground owing to lack of economies of scale.....and yet letter (Appendix A) from BDC Conservation Officer to site owner at 453 states: “there is merit in retaining as much as possible of this historic orchard space”
1646	41	With this statement the BDC Conservation Officer is yearning for a land use not seen on site 296 since the century before last. Had the 19th century cattle grazers on site 294 been directed to desist from producing beef and required to stick with apple production on the basis that that land use had “spatial merit”, the Conservation Officer might have had a stronger foundation on which to make his claim. Had the 20th century chicken farmers on site 294 been directed to desist from producing chickens OR beef but required to rely instead on supporting their families with apple production on the basis that that land use had “spatial merit” – the Conservation Officer may have had a stronger foundation on which to make his claim. The fact is that those farmers of yesteryear were not directed to do anything of the kind. Land-use evolved according to best use of resources and the necessity to do the same is truer today in the context of global agricultural markets, climate change predicted to take swathes of world agricultural land out of production by 2050 (Oxfordshire Farming Conference 2012) and new house building at its’ lowest level since 1920’s (CLG data “Laying the Foundations”).
1646	42	The late Robert Troop, father of site owners Kate Lucas and Jane Jones, son of chicken farmer Cicely Troop, first contacted Bassetlaw regarding non-viability of site 296 through the Local Plan process having seen the site drawn out of the settlement, in the local newspaper, without consultation. The current 2011/12 consultation process is the first time that a formal opportunity has been provided by Bassetlaw for site owners to make the case for agricultural obsolescence and residential development on site 296. The landscape character of yesteryear perpetuating a non-viable use on a site surrounded by residential development and a major trunk road, is mere whimsy.
1646	43	Tellingly, the Conservation Officer signs off his letter with the words “Clear as Mud!” intimating that he has been directed to make statements under the guise of conservation. On a day to day level, planning agent Eve Fawcett confirms that BDC Conservation Officer is most helpful and certainly not averse to sympathetic development on site 296. A number of his recommendations reference appropriate architectural advice have been gratefully received and taken into account prior to our planning consultation event. The balance of power in Bassetlaw Planning is not comprehended. In other LPA’s, conservation is a respected professional service used to inform Planning Policy and Development Control thereafter. At Bassetlaw, Appendix A illustrates that policy and DC influence conservation when seeking to quash a proposal.
1646	44	The issue at the nub of site 296 function is this: it is obsolete for agriculture and almost no-one can see it.
1646	45	The issue at the nub of site 296 character is this: it is surrounded by a 12ft (height) by 2 ft (width) Hawthorn Hedge on 2 sides aged in excess of 40 years (planted when route of A631 was altered) and cannot be seen by Everton residents besides 3 unfortunate households facing south on The Willows who overlook a farmyard dumping ground.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1646	46	At present the density, height and maturity of the Hawthorn Hedge means that when viewed north from A631 by pedestrians/cyclists/drivers/vehicular passengers, the only viewing point across the assorted machinery, log piles, building material and sand dumps is provided by the access gate situated within the hedge. The by-passer would need to ensure that they looked into site 294 for the duration of the gate width in order to understand the content behind the hedge. We therefore dispute that 294 should be protected as open space on the grounds of amenity and village character on the basis that no amenity is offered by this private site beyond the hedge.
1646	47	At present the density, height and maturity of the Hawthorn Hedge means that when viewed east from Chapel Lane by pedestrians/cyclists/drivers/vehicular passengers, the only viewing point across the assorted machinery, log piles, building material and sand dumps is provided by the access to site 453 (where planning approval 19/09/00001 granted permission for an access road bisecting the length of the “historic orchard” – clearly not viewed as such in 2009!). The by-passer would need to ensure that they looked into site 294 for the duration of site 453 access width in order to understand the content behind the hedge. We therefore dispute that 294 should be protected as open space on the grounds of amenity and village character on the basis that no amenity is offered by this private site beyond the hedge.
1646	48	Until 2009 when a 6m x 21m x 21m steel reinforced concrete Dutch barn aged in excess of 30 years was taken down by R.Troop and Son, the passer-by on High Street would have had zero west sight-line into site 294. The Dutch Barn was taken down as part of a BDC approved move to a more appropriate site. With full implementation of residential approval 19/07/00032 sight lines west into site 294 from High Street will once again be fettered by boundary walls et al. We therefore dispute that 294 should be protected as open space on the grounds of amenity and village character on the basis that no amenity is offered by the site.
1646	49	Furthermore, it is felt that Bassetlaw Planning Dept has misinterpreted the Latham’s Village Character Appraisal for Everton. The study clearly evidences the historic village core moving from Church and Post Office Street area to A631/High Street/Mattersy Road cross roads in the 18th century with Pub, Post Office, Artisan Cottages (Blacksmiths, Butchers), Chapels x 2 all gravitating towards the new centre of activity both sides of the now-named A631. The interpretation here is that site 294 has not represented the village edge for some considerable time. In 2012, a significant percentage of Everton Village is located on the south side of the A631 – why then manufacture a “rural fringe” along the A631 when the “fringe” rests elsewhere? The settlement boundary to Everton takes in the entirety of residential units along Mattersy Road and the Lathams report concludes that site 294 appears therefore as a “missing tooth” having no benefit to the character of the conservation area as open space.
1646	50	Yes we agree with this criterion
1646	51	No we do not agree with this criterion in the context of Rural Service Centres. This is because they are located in rural locations comprising many 1000’s acres of open countryside, footpaths, bridleways etc....Requiring green infrastructure beyond kiddie play park, sports field, cricket pitch, bowling green, tennis courts (whatever) is unnecessarily indulgent, represents poor land use and limits the ability of new households to enjoy a rural lifestyle/add “fresh blood” to settlements that by nature, have low turnover.
1646	52	Yes we agree with this criterion.
1646	53	Is new development on the proposed site able to benefit from renewable energy sources
1646	54	This question is not asked in Retford/Worksop/Harworth Bircotes/Carlton in Lindrick or Langold sections. I.e: Local residents in those urban settlements do not have the opportunity to state where excess growth should be awarded in the context of their own settlement not achieving adequate site allocations following downgraded housing targets arising from consultation. They are only asked if they would like more
1646	55	Yes we do agree that enough land should be allocated in Everton for at least 13 new houses.
1646	56	No our view does not change when considering the 9 dwellings commenced at Corner Farm. We understand that the 5 ACIS dwellings will not occur because they have no grant. Why is the word “and” emphasised in bold? Clumsy attempt at manipulation.
1646	57	Preferred site for future development is 296 and 453.
1646	58	Sorry my plan is in black and white. Would not want to see Metcalfe sports field or park go. School should have room to expand if sports field was used more – could push playground into existing grass.
1646	59	Site 296/453 is surrounded by residential development on 3 sides with road on 4 th side. Residential development on site 296/453 will therefore be compatible with neighbouring land uses.
1646	60	We feel confident of delivering a sympathetic and attractive gateway to Chapel Lane. Site 296 has the benefit of the Village Character Appraisal, layout designed by Latham’s and advice from Conservation Officer Oliver Scott. We have been out to public consultation on 3 sympathetic layouts with positive results.
1646	61	We are confident that latent comments regarding highways/access can be overcome in the knowledge that site 296 has 3 potential access/egress points. We are in close contact with site owner at 453 and prepared to work together to resolve any issues. Comments available on the Parish Council website (minutes of 5.12.11 meeting) refer to congestion on Chapel Lane and High Street. We believe these to be lesser issues than described and will forward the results of our own traffic survey. Increasing the number of pedestrians in the village as opposed to those using services from outside the village and arriving in cars to do so, is to be considered positively.
1647	1	I would like to object to the proposed application for the development of 900 houses and a travellers site on the outskirts of Retford around the Welham Road/Iverton Road area to the east.
1647	2	I feel there will be a considerable amount of additional traffic generated due to the extra dwellings
1647	3	Existing homes in the area will lose privacy
1647	4	The development will have a dramatic effect on vegetation and nature.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1648	1	This development will encroach on the dividing land between Worksop and Carlton in Lindrick and Wallingwells. This will only further contribute to the 'urban sprawl' and close the gap between the communities further.
1648	2	The area proposed in productive agricultural land farming wheat and oilseed rape, agricultural land provides employment which will be lost as a result of this development.
1648	3	The area proposed is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing, housing places on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands. The area 'Gateford Hill Park' which includes Dog kennel Plantation is a mature landscaped area.
1648	4	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Montford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is boarded by beautiful old trees and hedgerow which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. This bridleway is used by many walkers daily from the estate and many visiting recreational users.
1648	5	The loss of this countryside amenity would be detrimental to the entire area. This land is of the same importance to us, and the wildlife as Dog kennel Planation.
1648	6	Our 'local' shops which are sites off the estate are already busy. Additional housing will only cause increased pressure on these already busy and dangerous road junctions leading in and out of the shopping areas. The main amenities e.g. supermarkets, shops, doctors and dentist are all situated in the town especially when Tesco moves. Access to the town is only practical by car and with difficulty on public transport. Congestion in and out of town will only increase therefore as a result of this development.
1648	7	The junction between Ashes Park Avenue and Gateford Road is already dangerous due to heavy traffic levels. The increase in traffic levels on the estate will generally reduce the quality and safety of our environment.
1648	8	This development will require detailed consideration as to the provision of schools and nurseries as we feel our schools are already too or over capacity.
1649	1	If possible and appropriate, I would like to leave the planning of the area, including the entrance and exit of course, to your planners or planners of the Council's choice, if the job comes about, that is.
1649	2	I have always thought that the large plot having one entrance and one exit is an ideal plot for a good standard of dwellings, the plot is away from noise and unsightly buildings.
1649	3	The people taking this standard of housing causes movement on the housing ladder and benefits the younger seeking their first homes.
1650	1	In Retford, our Clients; land interests extend to site ref 364 and 365. The allocation of site 364 (and part 365) combined with the adjoining site 41 would represent a sustainable extension to the existing settlement, and there is a willingness from both landowners to work together to deliver a comprehensive residential-led development. the allocation of these sites would help to ensure that the housing requirement in Retford can be achieved, particularly given that our Client considers the Council has over-estimated the housing contribution from existing commitment and 'live' applications. Additionally, our Client supports the opportunity to explore an element of employment use on these sites as part of a self-sustaining development opportunity.
1650	2	In respect of Harworth Bircotes, our Client's landholdings to the south of the town are identified within the Council's adopted Core Strategy as the focus for economic development within Bassetlaw District. The allocation for employment-led mixed-use development would serve to deliver the "step change" needed in the town. As part of these representations, our Client's site has been promoted for residential development alongside employment uses to demonstrate the potential for the comprehensive mixed-use development of the entire land parcel bound by Snape Lane, Blyth Road and the A614 Bawtry Road. This follows previous meetings with the Council (both Officers and Members) at which a range of options and uses for the site have been discussed, and which would contribute to the "step change" needed in the town.
1650	3	As Evidence Base documents to inform the Council's Local Development Framework, our Client supports the use of these documents as the initial starting point to help inform the judgement on which sites should be progressed through the Site Allocations DPD. However, our Client does have some concerns over some of the information contained within the SHLAA, some of which is not up-to-date in respect of the planning status of sites. Furthermore, in calculating the housing requirement for each settlement identified within the SAIO, the Council has made an allowance for sites with extant planning permission (as of 31 st March 2010), as well as those which could shortly benefit from planning permission. Our Client does not consider this approach to be robust, particularly in respect of making an allowance for sites which could shortly benefit from planning permission as this could be seen to be pre-determining the planning process.
1650	4	Our Client has concerns over a number of these criteria for the reasons set out below, and in particular the weight to be afforded to each as part of the Stage 2 site identification process.
1650	5	Whilst our Client does not disagree with the inclusion of this criterion forming part of the Stage 2 site identification process, they are nevertheless concerned over the amount of weight which the Council appears to be attaching to "community support."
1650	6	Firstly, the Council does not define how "significant" public opinion will be in the context of the other 8 criteria. Is public opinion, for example, considered more significant than the environmental impacts of development, and the impacts on neighbouring land-uses? How can the Council guarantee that those responses which will form the basis of its assessment are actually representative of wider public opinion within a particular town/village, particularly given that in the context of a consultation document such as this the majority of respondents are more likely to object to a site than support its allocation? And finally, how is it proposed that "strong" and "some" will be measured in respect of the green and amber grading? In view of these concerns, our Client considers that the "significance" to be afforded to this criterion should carry no more weight than the other factors to be taken into consideration by the Council in its site assessment process.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1650	7	This criterion seems to be steered towards employment and mixed-use sites, as opposed to housing sites. This would seem to suggest that housing development would not help deliver any economic development opportunities. Our Client is concerned that this criterion is far too simplistic in terms of how it is applied to housing sites, and fails to recognise the important role that housing development has to play in supporting and facilitating economic growth. The grading system as currently proposed would appear to suggest that no housing sites can score higher than “amber” given that housing is not defined within Planning Policy Statement 4: “Planning for Sustainable Growth” as constituting “economic development.” In reality however, the delivery of new housing can, depending on the nature and location of the site, make a significant contribution towards economic growth and prosperity. Our Client therefore considers that the grading system should be amended to reflect this by allowing for an assessment of the “economic” merits of individual sites, through which some housing sites would have the potential to score “green” under this criterion.
1650	8	Whilst our Client does not disagree with the inclusion of this criterion, it is nevertheless considered that greater clarity is required to distinguish between housing and employment sites.
1650	9	This is not reflected in the proposed grading system set out in the SAIO, which in its present form simply scores sites depending on the SPZ within which they lie. Our Client considers that the grading system should be amended to differentiate between housing and employment uses in SPZs 1, 2 and 3 in order to more closely reflect the considerations of the Environment Agency.
1650	10	Our Client considers that the grading system applied to this criterion does not take into account individual site characteristics and their ability to accommodate development, and appears to simply score sites based on which Landscape Character Zone (LCZ) they lie within.
1650	11	Furthermore, it is noted that the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (“BLCA”) contains a number of additional LCZ’s which are not referenced within the SAIO, and it is unclear how these will be dealt with by the Council as part of its grading strategy.
1650	12	Consequently our Client considers that the Council should re-visit and amend the grading system for this criterion so that it captures all of the LCZ’s contained in the BLCA, as well as building in sufficient flexibility to take account of individual site characteristics.
1650	13	This appears to be a ‘catch-all’ criterion which could reasonably include criteria 4 to 8. Our Client therefore considers that this criterion should include the list of constraints which are to be considered under criterion 9, or alternatively criteria 4 to 8 could be deleted and captured under criterion 9
1650	14	It is noted by our Client that the list of criteria does not include an assessment of site deliverability, in particular the suitability, achievability and availability of each site. Our Client considers that an additional criterion should be included within the Stage 2 assessment, as follows: G - The site is deliverable during the plan period. A - The site is deliverable during the plan period, subject to resolving some constraints. R - The site is not deliverable during the plan period.
1650	15	Firstly, there are no references anywhere within the SAIO to those housing sites with extant planning permission (or which will shortly have planning permission) which the Council have accounted for when calculating the residual housing requirement of each settlement. Instead, it is necessary to refer to the SHLAA to try and identify these sites.
1650	16	Moreover, by accounting for extant (and emerging) permissions in its calculation of residual housing requirements for each settlement, the Council is placing significant reliance on all of these sites being delivered during the plan period, whilst also potentially pre-determining the decision of ‘live’ applications. Given the poor economic and residential market conditions which have been experienced over recent years, there is no certainty when and indeed if these sites will come forward. Furthermore, if planning permissions lapse prior to a material start on-site, there can be no certainty that a new consent (or time-limit extension) will be granted or even sought by the applicant.
1650	17	Our Client does not consider this to be consistent with Table 4.1 of the Core Strategy given that the identified residual requirement for Retford stands at 1,574 dwellings and not 577 dwellings. Our Client considers that Table 5.1 of the SAIO should instead identify the housing land allocations which are needed in Retford during the plan period, as opposed to the residual requirement which is already known to stand at a minimum of 1,574 dwellings. It is our Client’s view that in reality, the required housing land allocations in Retford are in fact much higher than the 577 dwellings identified in Table 5.1 of the SAIO, and the Council has overestimated the number of dwellings which will come forward from sites with planning permission (as of 31 st March 2010), or which may shortly benefit from planning permission.
1650	18	Given that no details of those sites with extant planning permission, or which are the subject of ‘live’ planning applications, are provided within the SAIO, we have instead had reference to the Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) published in October 2011 (as referenced in footnote 23 of the SAIO). We have reviewed each of those sites in Retford which currently fall within either category to establish their current planning status (as of 31 st January 2012). In doing so, our Client considers that the Council has overestimated the contribution of several committed sites to the housing land supply in Retford. Details of these specific sites are set out in Table 4.1. By deducting a cumulative total of 258 units from the Council’s supply of 852 dwellings based on its SHLAA sites, our Client considers that the housing land allocation requirement in Retford during the plan period currently stands at a minimum of 911 dwellings.
1650	19	Whilst our Client supports the overall housing growth proposed in Retford, in response to Question 9 our Client considers it absolutely imperative that the Site Allocations DPD allocates sufficient housing land to meet the requirement of 911 dwellings over the plan period. Furthermore, the housing target of 2,002 dwellings set out in the Core Strategy is a minimum, with Policy CS3 stating that Retford should accommodate <u>at least</u> 1,547 new homes. Accordingly, our Client considers that the Site Allocations DPD should allocate sufficient housing land to at least meet this minimum target during the Core Strategy Plan Period and beyond.
1650	20	This site is located furthest south of all potential housing sites in Retford. The site is detached from the existing settlement, with agricultural land lying between the site and existing residential development to the north. The agricultural land to the immediate north of the site is also identified in the SAIO for development (site ref. 52), which it is reasonable to expect would come forward for development ahead of this site.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1650	21	The site is also located within flood zones 2 and 3, whilst there is also a potential area of archaeological interest across part of the site. These constraints should be taken into account by the Council when establishing the net developable area of the site, and potential dwelling capacity
1650	22	Notwithstanding the above, given the site's significant constraints, our Client does not consider this site to be suitable or achievable for development during the plan period, and thus should not be taken forward through the Site Allocations DPD.
1650	23	This site is subject to significant access constraints, which the Council itself acknowledges within its SHLAA. Although the SHLAA does seem to suggest that other access points could be explored, very little detail regarding these is provided, and there are no obvious solutions to overcome this significant development constraint.
1650	24	Furthermore, the site is located within a Conservation Area. This will inform and impact on the capacity of the site, currently identified as 267 dwellings, to the extent that our Client considers that a lower density of development below 30 dwellings per hectare would be more appropriate. This would ensure that any development is sensitive to its surroundings and protective of local character.
1650	25	Regardless of these conservation considerations however, our Client considers that the ability to secure access into the site is a considerable constraint for which there is no acceptable solution. Accordingly, our Client considers that the site should not be pursued through the Site Allocations DPD. It is distant to key services, areas of employment and facilities in the town.
1650	26	This is the largest of all the potential housing sites in Retford, with an estimated capacity of 716 dwellings. The development of this site would represent a large-scale urban extension to the north of the settlement.
1650	27	de from its partial location within flood zone 2, there do not appear to be any other identified constraints to its development.
1650	28	Notwithstanding this, our Client considers that there are more preferable, smaller alternatives to the development of this large site in the short to medium term, which would undoubtedly have an impact on services and infrastructure within that part of Retford.
1650	29	The SHLAA confirms that this site is currently a protected employment site, and thus may be subject to potential contamination issues which would need to be addressed in advance of any residential development taking place. This could also impact on the viability of the site's redevelopment.
1650	30	Furthermore, part of the site is identified as lying within flood zone 2 which could impact on the net developable area of the site.
1650	31	These policy and physical constraints are considered to be significant, and would certainly impact on the delivery of the site in the short to medium term. Our Client considers that at best this site is a long-term opportunity site, which will require significant investment to undertake remediation works. It is our Client's view that there are sequentially preferable housing sites which could be allocated within Retford which would negate the need to allocate this site.
1650	32	This site is situated immediately adjacent to the southern edge of Retford settlement. However, the site is subject to a number of major development constraints. The first of these involves the ability to secure vehicular access,
1650	33	Whilst the site also falls partly within flood zones 2 and 3, a major constraint which would be very likely to impact on the net developable area of the site.
1650	34	The assumption that 90% of the site is developable is therefore considered by our Client to represent a significant over-estimation, and the figure of 143 dwellings does not represent an accurate reflection of the site's capacity.
1650	35	This site is identified in the SAIO as a mixed-use opportunity site, with the potential to accommodate 166 dwellings. Our Client has a number of concerns regarding this capacity figure.
1650	36	These concerns relate principally to physical constraints associated with the site's development, namely the presence of power lines across the central part of the site, and archaeological interests in the north-west corner of the site. Our Client considers that both of these constraints will impact on the net developable area of the site, and that the Council is over-estimating the housing contribution of this site by calculating capacity based on 30 dwellings per hectare and a net developable area of 80%. Our Client considers that further detailed investigation is needed if this site is to be pursued through the Site Allocations DPD, principally focusing on the cost of relocating the high-voltage power lines underground, and the extent of the area of archaeological interest.
1650	37	Our Client notes that a large proportion of this site is identified as lying with flood zone . Given that Planning Policy Statement 25 seeks to direct new development to areas of low flood-risk, our client considers there to be better-placed and sequentially preferable sites available within Retford to meet its housing requirement during the plan period.
1650	38	Together with concerns over accessibility, our Client does not consider that this site should be taken forward through the Site Allocations DPD.
1650	39	This site was previously subject to planning permission for the development of 20 dwellings. However, this planning permission expired in January 2010, and no new planning permission has been sought. The site is subject to access constraints as identified within the SHLAA, and which has ultimately led to uncertainty over its deliverability. Given that the previous planning permission was never implemented, our Client considers there to be serious doubts over the deliverability of this site for residential development without a commitment for significant investment to upgrade the existing highway along the front of the station to adoptable standards.
1650	40	This site was subject to planning permission for 60 apartments prior to the expiry of the planning consent in June 2011. No new planning permission has been sought, and the SHLAA has identified that there are concerns over the deliverability of the site in view of the site's location within flood zone 2 which has significantly impacted on the net developable area of the site to the extent that the SHLAA only considers the site capable of accommodating 10 dwellings. Given the uncertainty regarding the site, and the fact that the original planning permission was never implemented or renewed, our Client does not consider that this site should be pursued for allocation through the Site Allocations DPD.
1650	41	This site is located to the immediate north of site ref. 3, and has the same constraints in respect of securing a suitable vehicular access. Grove Coach Road is unsuitable as an access point, and considerable costs would be involved in upgrading this route to acceptable standards. Accordingly, our Client does not consider that this site is suitable for residential development, and should not be allocated as such in the Site Allocations DPD.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1650	42	The development of this site is subject to access constraints which would require improvements to Bracken Way to facilitate vehicular access. There is no known developer interest in the site at present, nor evidence of any willingness to undertake these highway works and bring the site forward. Accordingly, in the absence of significant works and funding to enhance access arrangements to the site, it is not considered to be deliverable at this time and thus should not be allocated in the Site Allocations DPD given the availability of alternative, deliverable sites.
1650	43	Our Client's land interests in Retford relate to site ref. 364 and 365 shown of Figure 5.1 of the SAIO. This land also forms part of the wider "Land south of Ordsall" area shown on Figure 5.3 of the SAIO. Our Client and the owners of site ref. 41 support the proposed housing allocation of site ref.'s 364 and 41 which adjoins the site to the east off Ollerton Road. Our Client is working jointly with the owners of site ref. 41 in jointly promoting this site for development.
1650	44	The comprehensive development of these two sites would represent a sustainable urban extension to the town, with their allocation offering the potential to make a very significant contribution towards what our Client considers to be a minimum requirement for at least 1,123 dwellings in Retford during the plan period. Not all of Site 365 is considered suitable, but the area to the east between the footpath and plot 364 is available and considered suitable.
1650	45	Details of our Client's site were submitted to the Council's draft Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in October 2011. Within these representations, it was confirmed that our Client's site is suitable, available and achievable for short-term residential development (0-5 years).
1650	46	The site is suitable for housing as: a) The site is well-related to the existing Retford settlement, and its location lends itself to residential development as a natural extension to the existing urban area.
1650	47	b) It has the potential to make a significant contribution to housing growth in Retford, delivering a mix of house types as part of a sustainable extension to the town
1650	48	c) Our Client has engaged with the landowner of adjoining site ref. 41, and it is considered that both sites can come forward as part of a single, comprehensive land release. Site ref. 41 would provide the primary vehicular access point into the site, and as with site ref. 364 and parts of site ref. 365 is well-related to the existing urban area
1650	49	d) Secondary vehicular access to the site is available from Sunningdale, and to the south to facilitate pedestrian and cycle access.
1650	50	e) The development of the site would not give cause to any harmful impacts on any sites or built/historic/ecological features of importance.
1650	51	f) Contrary to the findings of the SHLAA, the site is not subject to any archaeological interests and our Client has had an archaeological assessment of the site undertaken.
1650	52	g) Housing would not constitute a 'bad neighbour' use of the site, and would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.
1650	53	g) The site is not subject to any major development constraints. Whilst it does lie within Flood Zone 1, this is a standard Environment Agency provision for all larger sites, and is not a significant constraint to the site's development.
1650	54	h) It has good links to the town centre, schools and other key services. There is public transport available nearby which we expect could be extended into the site to make it more sustainable.
1650	55	The site has previously been actively promoted by Barton Willmore on behalf of our Client throughout the preparation of the Council's Core Strategy. This included appearing at the Core Strategy Examination. Our Client can confirm that the site is no subject to any legal or ownership issues, and that the site is immediately available for development in the short-term.
1650	56	Our Client can confirm that there is a very reasonable prospect that the site will be developed during the Core Strategy plan period. As such, the achievability of the site is without concern.
1650	57	Given the uncertainty that surrounds the deliverability of a number of other potential housing sites identified in the SAIO, our Client considers that the Council should prioritise the allocation and release of housing site ref. 364 and 365, together with site ref. 41, as part of a single, comprehensive development site. Both sites are sustainably located and well-related to the existing settlement, well-served by existing infrastructure, and deliverable. The landowners have expressed a strong willingness to work together to bring forward a sustainable development scheme. The allocation of these two sites in the Council's Site Allocations DPD would make a very significant contribution towards meeting the housing requirement in Retford during the plan period, with the potential to cumulatively deliver c. 500 dwellings. At the same time their allocation would reduce pressure on housing land release elsewhere in Retford particularly where it has been identified by our Client that a number of other housing sites are potentially undeliverable primarily due to concerns over their suitability and achievability. Their allocation would also open up the possibility in the longer-term of a sustainable mixed-use development linked to the land to the north of site ref. 364, a planning application for which is currently awaiting determination by the Council (App. Ref. 01/11/00311). Our Client therefore strongly encourages and fully supports the housing allocation of site ref.'s 364 and 41 in the Council's Site Allocations DPD.
1650	58	Our Client's land is identified on figure 5.3 of the SAIO as forming part of the wider land parcel known as "Land south of Ordsall." This area comprises three sites, namely site ref.'s 41, 53 and 364 and part of 365, with the potential to accommodate 95% housing (c. 1,200 houses), and 5% employment land (c. 5 hectares). The 5% employment land would form part of the 20% employment land which Core Strategy Policy CS3 envisages within Retford. Our Client supports the opportunity for employment uses within this part of Retford to form part of a sustainable, self-supporting extension to the settlement. The extent of the area which is developed will be the subject of further discussion and consideration, and in particular whether this covers the whole area shown on figure 5.3, or alternatively smaller-scale employment uses delivered as part of a comprehensive scheme comprising site ref.'s 364 and 41. Our Client is willing to engage in further discussions with the Council and the adjoining landowner on this matter during the on going preparation of the Site Allocations DPD.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1650	59	As set out in our response to Question 11 above, our Client supports the opportunity to introduce employment uses as part of the residential-led mixed-use development of site ref.'s 364 and 41 and, if identified by the Council as being required in the plan period, the additional parcel of land to the immediate west of site ref. 364 within our Client's ownership (site ref. 365). Introducing employment uses within this part of Retford would enhance the sustainability of site ref.'s 364 and 41, and the attractiveness of Retford as a place for people to live and work.
1650	60	To achieve this residual housing requirement, our Client is concerned that the Council is placing a significant over-reliance on residential development at Harworth Colliery. Table 6.1 of the SAIO identifies the potential for 996 new dwellings to be delivered at Harworth Colliery alone during the plan period. However, our Client considers this to be an over-estimation for the reasons set out below: a) The SHLAA states that development was due to start on site in summer 2011. Whilst the site has outlined planning permission, we understand that no development has commenced, and no Reserved Matters have as yet been submitted for approval; b) There will be significant lead-in times associated with securing reserved matters approval, discharging the planning conditions and planning obligations, and undertaking site remediation works (given that the majority of the site is contaminated). Our Client considers that this could reasonably take in the region of 24 months; c) Assuming a conservative start on-site date of 24 months (i.e. February 2014), our Client considers that no more than c. 700 dwellings would be delivered on the site before the end of the Core Strategy plan period on March 31st 2028 (based on 2 developers being on site at any one time between 2014 and 2028 delivering a cumulative total of c. 50 dwellings per year); and d) Doubts have been expressed as to whether the whole of this site would be developed. Our Client understands that there are still coal reserves which could be worked and with the ever increasing cost of fuel there is a possibility that the mining activities could recommence as the profitability of this improves. By developing the whole of the site this would not be possible in the future. On account of the current and future delays, the expected delivery from this site should be scaled back and monitored closely.
1650	61	In view of the above, and our suggested timescales which we consider to be highly conservative, our Client considers that the housing land allocation requirement in Harworth Bircotes during the plan period stands at a minimum of 861 dwellings. ² Consequently, our Client considers that the Site Allocations DPD will need to allocate sufficient land to achieve this increased but minimum housing requirement.
1650	62	Our Client's own land interests in Harworth Bircotes relate to the land south of the town, namely site ref. H4 as shown on figure 6.1 of the SAIO. Whilst our Client considers this site to represent a strategic employment-led opportunity, the potential for some housing on this site was previously identified in our Client's Harworth South Development Strategy Document ("DSD") submitted both to the Council, and to the Inspector, as part of their evidence to the Core Strategy Examination. We append a further copy of this DSD to these representations.
1650	63	The site does not fall into any Conservation Area. There are no known archaeological constraints.
1650	64	IDENTIFIED: The site is large and will be subject to Flood Zone 1 constraints. This is a standard starting point by the Environmental Agency for larger sites.
1650	65	IDENTIFIED: The site benefits from multiple existing access points. However some new roads will need to be created to facilitate development. Liaison with the Highways Agency will be required to review the potential impact on the A1M junction.
1650	66	Development of the site has some potential limited impact in respect of loss of landscaping. This can be mitigated by the comprehensive design of the wider site with structured landscaping. There is a significant area of land available to develop a prestigious comprehensive sustainable scheme.
1650	67	The site lies adjacent to Harworth Bircotes where the Council is proposing a step change in respect of both employment and housing growth. The site has the ability to contribute towards this growth as part of a comprehensive master planned approach. It also lies adjacent to Harworth Colliery where planning permission has been granted for its redevelopment over a 15-20 year period. The site is therefore suitable for residential development.
1650	68	The majority of the site is owned by a single landowner. The landowner appeared at the Core Strategy Examination and is promoting the site. Several meetings have been held with the Council. The site is available for development.
1650	69	The site is large and mostly greenfield. There are no overwhelming regeneration or contamination issues known that would affect the market attractiveness of the site.
1650	70	Given it is a large site, various studies and infrastructure costs will need to be addressed as part of the wider scheme. These are not uncommon for a large site and are not insurmountable.
1650	71	The site is mainly greenfield. The initial concept masterplan and development strategy suggests circa 12 hectares of land can be provided for residential development delivering around 420 dwellings (@ 35 dph). This would be delivered at around 50 dwellings per year based on two house builders on site. As the site is available now, construction could commence in 2013 if the Council enables a policy mechanism for the early release of land.
1650	72	The site is achievable. It has a willing landowner and it aligns with other policies which seek to deliver growth at Harworth Bircotes. It is only held now by the lack of an allocation.
1650	73	Expected start date- 2013.
1650	74	Our assessment has demonstrated that our Client's land south of Harworth Colliery is suitable, available and achievable for residential development, integrating new homes with new jobs to the south of the town. Accordingly, residential development is considered to represent an important component of the mix of uses which should be acceptable on our Client's site as part of an employment-led mixed-use allocation to inform the comprehensive development of the site. A residential element would help improve the viability of this predominantly employment-led site and, in the right location, could provide a choice and give some high quality residential for uses associated with the B1/B2 development.
1650	75	Our Client's landholdings in Harworth Bircotes are identified on figure 6.1 (map) of the SAIO (site ref. H4) for employment use, extending to an area of c. 69 hectares. The Council's Employment Land Capacity Study published in January 2010 identified this site as one of the most preferable locations to accommodate significant employment growth in Harworth Bircotes, and Bassetlaw District as a whole.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1650	76	The site's significant potential has now been identified within the Council's adopted Core Strategy, within which Policy CS1 identifies Harworth Bircotes as the "main regeneration settlement" in Bassetlaw with the expectation that it will accommodate at least 35% of new employment land. Policy CS4 (part (B)) of the Core Strategy identifies the land south of Harworth Bircotes as the primary growth area for economic development in Harworth Bircotes, benefiting from its proximity to the strategic road network (A1(M)) and Robin Hood Airport. The area is also well-served by public transport, another key characteristic of its sustainability.
1650	77	The medium to long-term development of the entire land parcel bound by Snape Lane, Blyth Road and the A614 Bawtry Road, the majority of which is in the single ownership of our Client, would introduce a diverse mix of new employment opportunities to the town and District as a whole, comprising a mix of B1, B2 and B8 uses. The quality of the environment to the south of the site also offers the opportunity to deliver high-quality housing to compliment this new investment as part of a comprehensive sustainable development, should the Council be unable to identify enough deliverable housing land elsewhere in the town.
1650	78	The potential development options for our Client's site are set out in Section 7 of the appended Harworth South DSD. However, the benefits of the site can be summarised as follows: a) It lies immediately adjacent to existing and proposed employment land; b) It is situated to the south of the town offering the potential to provide good connectivity to the heart of Harworth Bircotes, and contribute towards the sustainable growth of the town; c) It is not subject to any environmental designations; d) It is surrounded on all sides by development or roads, and thus is well contained; e) It is situated in close proximity to Junction 34 of the A1, offering excellent strategic transport links, and a commercially attractive location for inward investment; f) It is well-served by existing public transport given its proximity to Bawtry Road, which is served by several bus services; g) It has the capacity to accommodate a wide range of business uses at various scales as defined in PPS4, and redress of the balance of employment provision in Bassetlaw; and h) It is located close to the Harworth Colliery site and thus can offer a complimentary and supporting role to the type of development which is proposed there.
1650	79	With regards to other potential employment sites in Harworth Bircotes, it is noted that figure 6.1 (map) of the SAIO identifies a further potential employment allocation to the south of our Client's landholdings, namely site. ref H6 which extends to 21 hectares. Unlike our Client's site, this site is remote and detached from the existing built-up area of the town to the north. Its development would not provide the same opportunity as site ref. H4 to integrate employment opportunities with existing and consented residential development, nor represent a natural extension to the town.
1650	80	Notwithstanding this, should the Council ultimately seek to allocate site ref. H6 for employment use(s), then our Client strongly considers that site ref. H4 should be allocated for release ahead of this site given that it is deliverable, and by virtue of its location would represent a sustainable extension to the existing urban area (and that of the consented new development at the former Harworth Colliery site).
1650	81	As set out in our response to questions 17 and 18, our Client has ownership of the large area of land to the south of Harworth Bircotes (site ref. H4). The appended Harworth South DSD demonstrates the mix of uses which can be accommodated on this site, and the significant economic and social benefits which it would generate not only in Harworth Bircotes, but Bassetlaw as a whole. The DSD demonstrates the site to have significant potential for mixed-use development, comprising B1, B2 and B8 employment uses, leisure uses, and housing. The Council's Core Strategy identifies the need for a "step change" in Harworth Bircotes, and Policy CS4 (part (B)) identifies the land to the south of Harworth Bircotes as the focus for economic development in the town. The benefits of the site are considerable, as set out in our Client's response to question 18 (Section 7.0). Not only will its development create significant new job opportunities by attracting inward investment to the District, but it will also ensure that these jobs are accessible by local residents as well as people living outside the town in view of the site's excellent strategic linkages, something which our Client regards as key to realising a "step change" in Harworth Bircotes. Our Client therefore strongly encourages and fully supports the allocation of site ref. H4 for mixed-use development in the Council's Site Allocations DPD.
1650	82	In the absence of an up-to-date Open Space Audit and Need Assessment, our Client considers that existing open space in Retford and Harworth Bircotes should be protected from any future development proposals at this time, particularly given the availability of other deliverable sites for residential development. National planning policy set out in PPG17 seeks to protect and retain open spaces where possible in view of the important contribution which these make to residential amenity, and leisure and recreational activities.
1650	83	Our Client considers that the Council should be seeking to protect and enhance existing open spaces, and where possible encourage the creation of new formal and/or informal open spaces as part of major development sites for leisure and/or recreational use. Our Client's landholdings south of Harworth Bircotes for example offer the potential for the creation of some new open space as part of the comprehensive mixed-use development of the site. The same applies at Ordsall and to sites 364 and 365.
1651	1	Our Client has serious concerns in relation to the Site Assessment Criteria that is to be used in identifying sites for the preferred options stage under Stage Two of the Site Allocations Screening Methodology Section. The first of these concerns relates to Criterion 1, which asks whether the local community is supportive of the development of the site. Whilst our Client recognises that a key aim in the Localism Act and draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is to involve local communities in decisions that affect the areas they live in, this paragraph seems to suggest that public opinion is more important than other factors in deciding between sites and that local support for or against a site will be the deciding factor. Is the Council suggesting that this criterion will be weighted in some way to reflect the perceived importance of local opinion in identifying sites? If so, this is not made clear within the SAIO text. Our Client would disagree that local opinion is a more important factor than say, environmental concerns and would object to any suggestion that this criterion should be "a significant factor in the decision-making process". As part of this, we note that responses received to this consultation will not necessarily be representative of wider public opinion as it is considered on the location of new development is more likely to solicit negative responses from the vocal minority than a rounded responses from the wider community as a whole. It is therefore recommended that responses from the local community to the SAIO should be treated with caution and this criterion should have no more importance than other factors in identifying preferred options sites.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1651	2	This criteria seeks to grade sites in the basis of how they assist in the delivery of the Council's economic objectives. This criterion appears to suggest that the development of any site for housing would not lead to the delivery of economic development opportunities. Whilst our Client agrees that housing in itself is not defined as 'economic development' under Planning Policy Statement 4: 'Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth' (PPS4), it should be recognised that housing is often needed to support the delivery of economic development elsewhere. Furthermore housing itself generates jobs, investment and future expenditure in an area. It is important for the Council to recognise and acknowledge that the larger the housing site, the larger the benefits that come with it. Our client has an in-house toolkit which demonstrates that the following benefits increase in accordance with the size of the site: a) Direct FTE Construction Employment; b) Direct FTE Construction Employment; c) Indirect/Induced FTE Employment; d) Increased Gross Potential Spending Power; e) Potential Retail Employment f) Potential Leisure Employment and g) LPA Revenue (Council Tax Receipt and New Homes Bonus Payment). Our Client feels that it would be unfair to automatically grade sites for the development of housing only as 'amber' in the scoring system as each site is different and some housing sites will assist in the delivery of economic development opportunities by providing housing to support the creation of new jobs. Therefore, sustainable housing sites may well be able to score 'green' under this criteria. Our Client recommends that the Council should consider the intricacies of each site rather than just the existing nature of the site and the type of development proposed in scoring sites under Criterion 3. It should reflect a qualitative assessment rather than just purely just a quantities assessment in order to reach a true and balanced score.
1651	3	Our Client disagrees with the scoring outcomes in relation to Groundwater Source Protection Zones (SPZs).
1651	4	Whilst this paragraph recognises that housing is not viewed as a polluting activity and that the proposed use of a site will be taken into consideration in the scoring of a site under this criterion, the grades shown do not reflect this and merely seek to score sites depending on the SPZ they fall within. Our Client recommends that the grading system is altered to recognise the type of development proposed as follows: G - Not in a SPZ or housing development in SPZs 2 or 3. A - Employment development in SPZs 2 or 3 or housing development in SPZ1. R - Employment development in SPZ1.
1651	5	Our Client notes that this criterion draws heavily on the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (BLCA) of August 2009. It is considered that the scoring system is too simplistic when compared with the content of the BLCA. The scoring system is based on which Landscape Character Zone (LCZ) sites fall within, with sites in a 'create' LCZ scoring 'green', those in a 'restore or reinforce' LCZ scoring 'amber' and those in a 'conserve' LCZ scoring 'red'. Our Client notes that there are many more LCZs defined in the BLCA. How does the Council propose to deal with sites that are within the 'conserve and create' LCZ for example?
1651	6	In addition, the scoring system does not take account of the capacity of sites to accommodate development, taking into account such factors as tree cover and topography. Again, the nuances of each site should determine the score in relation to this criterion rather than blind reliance on the BLCA. Furthermore, the BLCA notes that in the 'conserve' LCZ for example, landscape actions should "encourage the conservation of distinctive features and features in good condition" but does not specifically prevent development from occurring in these areas. Our Client considers that factors such as these should be taken into consideration in the scoring of sites in relation to this criterion.
1651	7	The scoring also needs to take in to account opportunities to enhance landscape conservation where new defensible boundaries can be created through landscaped buffer zones
1651	8	Our Client notes that the residual housing requirement for Harworth Bircotes in the remaining plan period 2010-2028 is 499 dwellings (Core Strategy residual requirement of 1,560 dwellings less 1,061 committed dwellings). Our Client has some concerns in relation to the committed dwellings listed in the SHLAA, particularly site 189 (Harworth Colliery). This issue is discussed below, including how it impacts on the residual requirement and five-year supply.
1651	9	This site already has planning permission for up to 996 dwellings (Reference 01/09/00052). The SHLAA states that 161 of these dwellings will be delivered within five years. We note from the planning permission that 141 dwellings comprise Phase 1 of the proposed development. In addition, no reserved matters application has yet been submitted to the Council for Phase 1, such that the delivery of these dwellings is uncertain. Notwithstanding the extant permission, the applicant and Council have both indicated that the Colliery might be brought back into use at a later date subject to viability, which brings into question the deliverability of the 996 dwellings. Even if Phase 1 is implemented, the prospect of a further 855 dwellings being sited adjacent to the Colliery if it does reopen, would appear unlikely. If Phase 2 does proceed, it is considered that site construction is more likely to begin between 2018-2020 on the basis of a reserved matters application being submitted in 2012. Using the Council's own calculations of 50-75 dwellings per annum based on 2-3 developers on site, Phase 2 would take between 11 and 17 years to complete, taking the delivery of dwellings well beyond the plan period and impacting on the number of dwellings needed to make up the housing requirement during the current plan period.
1651	10	On the basis of the above, there is a significant risk that Harworth Bircotes could seriously underperform against its housing requirement should too much reliance be placed on this site coming forward. For this reason, our Client recommends that the Site Allocations DPD should include sufficient sites to ensure that there is enough land in the pipeline to fulfil the housing requirement without relying on the Colliery site. Taking the above into account, our Client believes that in order to maintain the flexibility of the Site Allocations DPD, 855 dwellings (the uncertain phase 2 Colliery contribution) should be added to the residual requirement, such that the Council needs to find sufficient land for 1,354 dwellings (499 + 855) in Harworth Bircotes. This adjusts the five-year requirement to 376 dwellings 2.16 ([1,354 / 18] x 5).
1651	11	The committed number of dwellings in the SHLAA total 306, which is 70 dwellings short of the adjusted five-year supply total. However, our Client is concerned that sites 376 and 378 (Land off Beverley Road and Land at the Piggeries, Scrooby Road), which together make up a contribution of 121 dwellings towards the requirement, predominantly comprise apartments and townhouses, for which there is little current interest in Harworth. As a consequence, it is unlikely that these dwellings will be delivered in the first five years of the plan. Therefore, our Client believes that the five year supply for Harworth Bircotes is 185 dwellings or 2.5 years supply, confirming the need to identify additional deliverable sites within the Site Allocations DPD

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1651	12	We made clear the Core Strategy EiP that our Client believes that Harworth Bircotes could be allocated a greater proportion of housing. It is noted that 35% of employment growth is directed towards the town whereas housing growth is just 22% of the overall requirement. In order to support that growth and provide a local, sustainable workforce, the level of housing growth could be even more reflective of the level of employment growth. On this basis, our Client recommends that at least 22% of housing growth be directed to Harworth Bircotes.
1651	13	Our Client believes that their site at Tickhill Road (Site 182) is a deliverable and sustainable housing site and should be allocated for residential development in the Site Allocations DPD. Section 3.0 of this Report sets out the reasons why this site should be allocated, including an assessment of the deliverability of the Site, as well as the benefits the development of the site can bring to Harworth Bircotes.
1651	14	Here, our Client reiterates the comments made above in relation to the deliverability of phase 2 of the Colliery site within the plan period and its impact on the residual requirement for Harworth Bircotes.
1651	15	This Site is located within the settlement of Harworth, east of Tickhill Road. It is classed as 'developable' within the SHLAA for approximately 45 dwellings. The SHLAA states that as Church Walk is an unadopted road (single, narrow track), access to the site will need to be taken from Styrrup Road. Whilst the SHLAA also states that there are no highways objections in principle to this, subject to meeting highways guidance, it is noted that the proposed access point would be in very close proximity to Church Walk, such that access for 45 dwellings from this point may not be achievable.
1651	16	Notwithstanding this, the SHLAA notes that there is an agreement with the adjacent landowner to provide access to the site from Styrrup Road, which confirms that the site is not in the control of one landowner. It is unclear whether this is a formal or informal agreement. If it is the latter, our Client suggests that there is no certainty that the access land will not form a ransom strip to the site in the future, should any informal agreement fall through. In this way, the site cannot be considered to be available as described in paragraph 39 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance (CLG, 2007).
1651	17	The SHLAA appears to have taken flood risk into account and bases the dwelling quantity on 90% of the total site area at 30 dwellings per hectare ($[1.68\text{ha} / 0.9] \times 30 = 45.36$).
1651	18	However, the SHLAA also states that the "the design of any scheme on the site would have to be sensitive to the Listed Buildings nearby". These include the Church of All Saints to the north and Syringa House and Barn to the south. In particular, Syringa House and Barn are in very close proximity to the site boundary such that sufficient space will need to be provided in this area to pay due respect to these buildings. Furthermore, the character of the immediate area (including the listed buildings), is predominantly low density detached or semi-detached properties. Taken together with the awkward shape of the site, we would suggest that the site could only yield approximately 30 dwellings.
1651	19	For the reasons set out above, our Client does not believe that this site is suitable for housing development at the present time due to access/highways considerations and cannot be considered to be available for development. On this basis, the site cannot make a contribution to the five year land supply for Bassetlaw and is only likely to contribute a maximum of 30 dwellings in years 6-10 of the plan period, should these constraints be overcome.
1651	20	Site 187 is a large site to the east of Bircotes, which is classed as developable in the SHLAA for approximately 791 dwellings in years 6-10 of the plan period. However, we note that there is a discrepancy between the dwelling numbers within the SHLAA document (791) and those shown on the potential sites map for Harworth Bircotes (841). This discrepancy of 50 dwellings should be clarified.
1651	21	Our Client is concerned that there are factors that haven't been fully taken into consideration in the assessment of this site, such as the impact of the development of the site on the surrounding landscape.
1651	22	The site is an irregular shape and extends into the countryside to the east of Bircotes. The southern part of the site in particular has limited defensible boundaries, such that the development of this site could lead to further extension into the countryside in future. Whilst the open land around Harworth Bircotes is not designated as Green Belt land, we note that the settlement of Bawtry in Doncaster is in close proximity to the north east. Our Client considers that it is important that a distinct gap between these two settlements remains.
1651	23	In addition, the site is highly visible from the A638, A614 and Scrooby Road with White House Plantation presenting a natural eastern boundary to the settlement, illustrative of the countryside feel of the locality. Our Client considers that the development of this site would erode the countryside character of this edge of Harworth Bircotes and suggests that this site, if developed, should be limited to that part to the west of White House Plantation. This would also give rise to access problems as it would seem unlikely that a large number of dwellings could be served from Essex Road.
1651	24	If highways considerations can be resolved, our Client believes that this site (as reduced) is only capable of accommodating a maximum of 350 dwellings.
1651	25	In addition, our Client disagrees that the Site could be completed within 3 years of its allocation. Due to the access constraint, it is unlikely that this site will be developed before Site 52, which itself is noted as being developable in 6-10 years. Furthermore, there are lead-in times to consider in obtaining planning permission and discharging conditions, which for a large site such as this can take many months, even years before work commences on site. Therefore it is unlikely that houses will begin to be delivered on this site before 10 years after the adoption of the Site Allocations DPD, should this site be allocated.
1651	26	This site is classed as developable in the SHLAA for 70 dwellings based on 90% of the total site area (2.59ha). However, we note that approximately 50% of the site is covered by trees. Without a tree survey it is not possible to determine how much of this site can be developed without adverse impact on trees and ecology. The capacity of the site is also impacted by the electricity sub station on site.
1651	27	Furthermore, the SHLAA states that the future use of the site is unknown (information from the landowner), such that the site cannot be considered available for development.
1651	28	As a result, our Client believes that the suggested capacity of 70 dwellings is too high when taking capacity constraints into account. Our Client suggests that 50% net developable area is more realistic, which yields a dwelling capacity of 39 dwellings based on 30 dwellings per hectare

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1651	29	This site, which is described as north of Scrooby Road is actually south of that road to the east of the settlement of Harworth Bircotes. It is assessed in the SHLAA as being developable for 293 dwellings. Similarly to Site 187, the site presents as open countryside with Droversdale Wood forming an important visual as well as ecological function. For this reason, our Client considers that the site is not suitable for development and should not be allocated, particularly as there are other, less sensitive sites capable of providing a sufficient number of dwellings to meet the overall requirement for Harworth Bircotes.
1651	30	Our Client's land at Tickhill Road, Harworth Bircotes is identified as Site 182 in the SAIO. The maximum potential capacity listed for this site on Figure 6.1 of the SAIO is 717 dwellings. The remainder of this section of the Report provides an assessment of the sustainability and delivery of Site 182.
1651	31	The site is located on the northern edge of Harworth Bircotes, approximately half a mile to the north of the shops on Scrooby Road and is therefore within walking distance (10 to 20 minutes) of the facilities located there. It is roughly equidistant from the towns of Worksop, Retford (both Bassetlaw) and Doncaster being around 8-10 miles from each by car/public transport. The A1/A1(M) and strategic road network is located approximately 10 minutes drive to the south. Bus stops serving Doncaster and Retford (Route 29) are within 5 minutes walking distance
1651	32	The site is also within easy access of a number of schools within Harworth Bircotes as well as doctor's surgeries and dental practices. There are also a range of employment opportunities offered to the south of the settlement of Harworth Bircotes.
1651	33	There are few constraints associated with the site, being largely flat and having no landscape features of intrinsic value within it
1651	34	The site is classified as Grade 3 agricultural land on the Agricultural Land Classification maps. It is noted that the majority of land adjoining the settlement of Harworth Bircotes is Grade 3 agricultural land, such that there are not any other sites of lower agricultural value than this site.
1651	35	The site is within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3. As the proposed use is housing, a non-polluting use, it is considered that this does not represent a constraint to the development of the site.
1651	36	The site is within a 'create' Landscape Character Zone in the BLCA such that the site would score 'green' against the SAIO methodology.
1651	37	Further work is being carried out in respect of archaeology and highways but nothing is expected that would affect the principle of development.
1651	38	The site is suitable for housing development as: a) It offers a suitable location for development, being located in close proximity to existing services
1651	39	b) It would contribute to the creation of sustainable mixed communities through the potential to provide an appropriate mix and type of housing on the site
1651	40	c) There are a number of potential access routes to the site from Tickhill Road, Baulk Lane and Meadow Way
1651	41	d) The identified constraints can be adequately dealt with
1651	42	e) The development of the site would have no impact on any designated conservation areas or listed buildings
1651	43	f) The development of the site would not present any adverse conditions which would be experienced by prospective residents.
1651	44	The site is available for residential development as there are no legal or ownership problems. The site is controlled by our Client, who has expressed an intention to develop the site for residential use at the earliest appropriate opportunity
1651	45	The site is controlled by our Client who has undertaken a thorough assessment of the marketability and economic viability of the development of the site, including an assessment of any exceptional costs associated with the development of the site.
1651	46	The Tiln Lane site is considered to be achievable for residential development as there is a reasonable prospect that the site can be developed now or at any point in the plan period through the adoption of an appropriate phasing strategy.
1651	47	The Tickhill Road site therefore represents a deliverable housing site under the terms of PPS3 and the SHLAA Practice Guidance as it offers a suitable location for housing development now, is available now and there is a reasonable prospect that housing can be delivered on the site within the next five years, through to the latter stages of the plan period
1651	48	As we have already referred to earlier, larger housing sites such as Site 182 can deliver a greater package of significant benefits compared to smaller sites. It also has the capacity to provide on site benefits such as a landscaped buffer zone to protect the adjacent areas and a generous amount of public open space.
1651	49	For these reasons, our Client recommends the allocation of Site 182 in the Site Allocations DPD as it is a sustainable and deliverable site with few constraints to overcome and can offer significant benefits to the local area.
1652	1	My clients do not wish to pass comment upon the process itself but merely wish to record that their above site remains available for future housing development. The site remains suitable for development, indeed part of the site has previously been included within the Defined Settlement Envelope for Retford under the recently expired Local Plan. My clients are prepared to sell the land for residential development and it is therefore available.
1652	2	You will be aware a planning application has been submitted on part of BAS0027 which is viewed as a positive indication of demand for the land and development on the site is achievable and therefore deliverable.
1652	3	The ability to link the part of the site now currently under application to the remainder of BAS0027 is seen as a positive feature for forward planning and ensuring future deliverability of housing in Retford. Please record this as a response at this stage of the process and in support of the promotion of the above named site.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1653	1	H E Brinkley Settlement, along with one other landowner, control approximately 5.6 hectares of land located to the north of the Chesterfield Canal and south of Ashdown Way, Misterton (SHLAA Site 93). The Council's assessment of the site within its Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment confirms the site is suitable for development. The size and location of the site affords significant flexibility as to layout of any development, including the potential for a mixed use development including canal related, employment generating, residential and open space/recreational uses in a high quality setting in close proximity to the centre of Misterton and its existing facilities and services.
1653	2	Development on the site could be phased, responding both to local housing needs and other opportunities, e.g. employment generation through canal related and leisure uses. A masterplanned approach would ensure early phases of development would not limit options on the remaining part of the site, within a framework appropriate to the site's long term potential and needs of Misterton and the local community. Responses to the specific questions posed by the consultation document are provided below. These further highlight the advantages offered by the above land to meet the long term needs and aspirations of the community.
1653	3	The criterion may be of some assistance but should not be used to the exclusion of all other considerations and evidence. Any evidence drawn upon in making assessments against the criterion must be publicly available. In respect of Criterion 1 ' <i>Is the local community supportive of the development of the site?</i> ', it is important that conclusions are drawn only from representative samples of community feedback. For example, only seven responses were received from Misterton to the Council's 'Residents' Survey' issued in February 2011. The consultation document states that Misterton has 943 houses. Assuming the seven responses were from different houses, this gives a response rate of only 0.7%, and so is unlikely to be representative.
1653	4	Land to the north of the Chesterfield Canal and south of Ashdown Way (SHLAA Site 93) offers a unique opportunity within Misterton to secure significant community benefits as an integral part of development. The site's position alongside the canal offers the potential for both recreational enhancements (with improved access to the canal corridor) and employment-generating uses (which could include a marina, chandlery and restaurant). Residential development could complement such uses, making use of the attractive setting of the canal and retained open spaces.
1653	5	The Core Strategy acknowledges that additional housing land may be required within the plan period if existing planning permissions are not built out. The SHLAA assesses the site's capacity as being 134 dwellings. The actual number of dwellings that would be appropriate for the site could be adjusted to be compatible with any other uses proposed for the site and housing needs. The location and shape of the site, including its two existing vehicular access points, means it offers flexibility to accommodate both small scale housing development (for example infill on land to the south of Meadow Drive and east of Ashdown Way) or larger scale development across the wider site (for example making use of access from Ashdown Way in addition to Meadow Drive). Land not required as part of development at that time offers flexibility to be retained for open space/recreational purposes and/or agriculture. As part of any development, the site could potentially accommodate additional allotments, for which there is a known requirement in Misterton.
1653	6	SHLAA Site 93 (see comments in response to Question 30 above).
1653	7	SHLAA Site 93. This site offers the potential for an attractive, high quality, mixed use development incorporating employment-generating, canal-linked (potential to include a marina, chandlery and restaurant) and recreational/leisure uses alongside new housing, well integrated with the existing urban form of Misterton but sensitive to its rural character and setting, including that of the Chesterfield Canal.
1653	8	Access to the canal, acknowledged within the consultation document by residents as being a 'key local asset' could be enhanced. Assessments undertaken by the landowners have confirmed the site can be developed without detriment to the safety or operation of the local road network.
1653	9	The site offers good links to existing walking and cycling routes with easy access to existing services and facilities within the settlement.
1653	10	Development on the site could be phased. A masterplanned approach would ensure early phases of development would not limit options on the remaining part of the site, within a framework appropriate to the site's long term potential and needs of Misterton and the local community. See also comments in response to Question 30 and 31 above.
1653	11	Appendix B of the consultation document lists ' <i>the background studies or reports that ...have been used to support this Site Allocations DPD</i> '. No open space study is listed. It is therefore unclear on what basis (and using what evidence) the sites suggested for allocation as 'Protected Open Space' have been identified. Prior to the completion and publication of an appropriate, evidence-based Open Space Study, it is not appropriate to consult on the potential protection of any land as 'Protected Open Space'. The identification of a selected number of sites at this time could confuse and prejudice the proper consideration of these issues following the publication of the appropriate, evidence-based Open Space assessment. Any responses supporting the identification of land as 'Protected Open Space' resulting from this consultation should therefore be set aside.
1653	12	Notwithstanding, the lack of identified evidence base in the consultation document, we are aware that the Council was undertaking a review of its Open Space Study in late 2011. It is understood that the review was undertaken in response to the promise made during the Public Examination into the draft Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD in Summer 2011. That review was to be of the whole study (i.e. 'Open Space 2008', the PPG17 Open Space Study and the Playing Pitch Strategy). The consultation undertaken as part of that review was limited to the methodology of and sites considered by the Council in 'Open Space 2008'. That would not appear to allow appropriate and necessary opportunity for the results to be 're-fed' into the assessments that were then carried out by the external consultants who contributed to earlier phases of the study. At the time of preparing this response the 'Review of the Open Space Study 2011' was not available on the Council's website. We are not aware if the review has been completed. There has been no opportunity to review and comment upon any conclusions it may have made.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1653	13	Through the comments we made to the Council in September 2011 on the Review of the Open Space Study, you will be aware that we objected to the inclusion of Site 33/9. The Review identified that site as 'Natural Green' (it was unclear if this was meant to refer to 'Natural Greenspace'). The land so identified is agricultural land. Public rights of way to this agricultural land are limited to a public footpath that runs east west through it. It was also unclear on what basis or criteria the area had been identified as Natural Green[space]. The identified area did not include all open land between the canal and the existing urban area of Misterton. Most of that open land is agricultural with limited variation in character. It is unclear why some agricultural land was included whereas adjacent land of identical or near identical character was not included. Any recommendations arising from a study based on an assessment of sites, the identification and definition of which is flawed will itself be flawed.
1653	14	There is no requirement to protect the land identified as SHLAA Site 93 / Open Space Site 33/9 as 'Protected Open Space'. Any control that may be required over any proposals for development on that land can be achieved through the application of existing policy and guidance, including the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD.
1653	15	Furthermore, the area of land suggested to be identified as Protected Open Space does not accurately reflect existing development boundaries and includes land that has planning permission for residential use and associated development. These matters have previously been raised with the Council, including within submissions to the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (Submission Stage) DPD.
1653	16	The area suggested for protection includes land to the rear of 5, 7 and 9 Ashdown Way, Misterton that has planning permission for residential use and associated development. Relevant permissions have been implemented. Relevant planning permissions include: • 1/33/97/1 – Land at rear of 9 Ashdown Way, Misterton – extend garden – approved 18th February 1997; • 33/01/00015 – Land rear of 5 and 7 Ashdown Way, Misterton - Change of use of agricultural land to domestic garden – approved 14th August 2001; • 33/03/00006 – Land south of Ashdown Way, Misterton – Erect 12 residential dwellings and construct; new access – approved 9th June 2003; • 33/05/00042 – 9 Ashdown Way, Misterton - Erect single storey rear extension, first floor extension, front porch extension and carry out internal alterations to separate existing office area from dwelling – approved 15th November 2005; • 33/08/00013 - 9 Ashdown Way, Misterton - Erect single storey rear extension, first floor extension, front porch extension and carry out internal alterations to separate existing office area from dwelling – approved 23rd May 2008; • 33/09/00003 - 9 Ashdown Way, Misterton – Erect garage and conservatory – approved 2nd April 2009; • 33/09/00022R - Erect garage and Conservatory (resubmission of 33/09/00003) – approved 21 st August 2009. Regardless of any decisions as to the allocation of land north of the Chesterfield Canal, the Development Boundary around Misterton should be amended to reflect the above permissions.
1654	1	Our clients control approximately 17.75ha of land fronting Shireoaks Road and Sandy Lane, formerly occupied by brickworks and company playing fields. On 1 December 2011, Bassetlaw Council resolved to approve an outline planning application for a comprehensive mixed use regeneration scheme on the site comprising office, industrial and warehouse units, food store, petrol filling station, a football stadium and five-a-side pitches. The proposed mix comprises a 5,500m2 foodstore with petrol filling station, 3,090m2 of hybrid office and light industrial units, 20,980m2 of industrial and warehouse units, a 3,000-seat stadium and club house, with associated parking and servicing. The resolution to grant is subject to satisfactory completion of a 5106 agreement which we understand to be well advanced. Responses to the specific questions posed by the consultation document are provided below. These further highlight the advantages offered by the above land to meet the long term needs and aspirations of the community. Do you believe that the town should be allocated more housing and/or employment growth, above that already required (especially if it would deliver additional benefits to the town)? If so, please give an indication of the amount of additional new development that you would like to see (e.g. numbers of houses).
1654	2	Worksop is a town in severe need of regeneration and economic growth. Policy 7 of the East Midlands Regional Plan (still in force at the time of writing), in particular, notes that Worksop should be significantly strengthened by providing new jobs, housing, services and facilities in and around its urban area. Clearly, if additional development delivered additional benefits to the town, which it undoubtedly would, it should be considered as appropriate.
1654	3	As the main settlement in the district, with existing connectivity and infrastructure it makes perfect sense to direct significant growth to the Sub-Regional Centre as a priority rather than other settlements. Alongside the significant employment opportunities identified through the resolution to grant planning permission at the former Vesuvius works, there remains an opportunity to consider the provision of additional residential development over a wider site as part of a genuinely mixed use, sustainable allocation. It would not be unreasonable to suggest that an additional 500 dwellings could be directed from smaller settlements if sufficient, suitable site cannot be found, and if local people wish to reduce the burden on local services.
1654	4	Alongside the significant employment opportunities identified through the resolution to grant planning permission at the former Vesuvius works, there remains an opportunity to consider the provision of additional residential development over a wider site as part of a genuinely mixed use, sustainable allocation
1654	5	Section 3 of the Worksop Questionnaire Feedback notes that the vast majority of respondents wanted to see brown field land prioritised for redevelopment, with 47.3% supporting the redevelopment of existing sites. The vast majority of respondent also said that there were specific sites they would like to see redeveloped, with the Vesuvius works being included. In this regard, it is unfathomable why the site has not been included for consultation as a potential mixed use allocation comprising employment, commercial and residential opportunities.
1654	6	Significant employment opportunities have been identified through the resolution to grant planning permission at the former Vesuvius works, there remains an opportunity to consider the site as part of a genuinely mixed use, sustainable allocation.
1654	7	Section 3 of the Worksop Questionnaire Feedback notes that the vast majority of respondents wanted to see brownfield land prioritised for redevelopment, with 47.3% supporting the redevelopment of existing sites. The vast majority of respondent also said that there were specific sites they would like to see redeveloped, with the Vesuvius works being included. In this regard, it is unfathomable why the site has not been included for consultation as a potential mixed use allocation comprising employment, commercial and residential opportunities.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1654	8	The mixed use sites identified on the potential sites map are all Greenfield sites. Section 3 of the Worksop Questionnaire Feedback notes that the vast majority of respondents wanted to see brownfield land prioritised for redevelopment (in accordance with national and Core Strategy Policy), with 47.3% supporting the redevelopment of existing sites. The vast majority of respondent also said that there were specific sites they would like to see redeveloped, with the Vesuvius works being included
1654	9	On 1 December 2011, Bassetlaw Council resolved to approve an outline planning application for a comprehensive mixed use regeneration scheme comprising office, industrial and warehouse units, food store, petrol filling station, a football stadium and five-a-side pitches, on 17.75ha of land fronting Shireoaks Road and Sandy Lane, formerly occupied by brickworks
1654	10	It is unfathomable, and a serious omission, that in the light of this resolution to grant, the former Vesuvius site and its hinterland have not been identified for consultation purposes as a major mixed use allocation and regeneration opportunity comprising both employment, commercial and residential opportunities. We fail to see how the consultation can be considered as a meaningful opportunity to consider alternatives, when such a significant scheme and opportunity has not been put to the community despite being identified by them through the initial consultation process and having a resolution to grant planning permission. As such we consider the Issues and Options consultation to be fundamentally flawed.
1654	11	<i>The Council is currently assessing the quality and value of open spaces in the District. The views of the local community will be important when determining whether a site should be protected or not. Do you think that the open spaces identified on the map should be protected from any future development proposals? "not, please provide further explanation.</i> The revised open space assessment should include, as far as possible, objective quantitative measures, such as the number of households within realistic walking, cycling and driving catchments and the number of people to whom a facility is regularly and realistically available. Only those facilities of high quality, or of particular value to a local community, should be protected. Because the Potential Sites Map shows generic 'Potential Protected Open Space', it is not clear in each case why land might be protected. Until the revised open space assessment has been completed it is not possible to comment on which sites should be protected in an informed way PPG17 paragraph 11 , states that only ' <i>Open space and sports and recreational facilities that are of high quality, or of particular value to a local community, should be recognised and given protection by local authorities through appropriate policies in plans</i> '. <i></i>
1654	12	In resolving to grant planning permission on the Vesuvius site, Bassetlaw Council has already assessed in great detail, the suitability, sustainability and availability of the land for mixed use redevelopment. In essence, it has already been through a detailed assessment methodology and has been found suitable. The local community should now be given the opportunity to comment on the potential of the wider site to accommodate a range of uses, including residential development as part of a genuine mixed use site. This is essential given the questionnaire feedback from Worksop residents, which specifically identified the site. We look forward to future input to the Site Allocations process and acknowledgment and identification of the site's potential in due course through allocation in the adopted Development Plan Document. I trust that you and, in due course, the Inspector, will consider these points and look forward to adoption of this DPD (duly amended) in due course.
1655	1	We act for Continuity Promotions Ltd in the matter of land and buildings at Blackstope Lane, Retford. The extent and location of the site is outlined in red on the attached plan. Outlined in blue is land in separate ownership, parts of which will be involved in future development proposals.
1655	2	As you are no doubt aware, detailed and on going discussions have already taken place with your colleague, *****, as part of the SHLAA process. Indeed, a further meeting is to be held on Wednesday 8 th February 2012 with representatives of the Council, the Environment Agency, Seem Trent and various technical/professional consultants on behalf of the owner. This is intended to resolve serious anomalies over the use, interpretation and validity of the available flood risk data. In particular, our clients and their advisers, will seek to demonstrate that the site is not at flood risk and that the SHLAA presumption against residential development is inappropriate.
1655	3	Given the modest scale of development envisaged and the very specific circumstances which are attached to it, we do not feel that it would be appropriate to respond in full to the Responses Form. Rather, we have addressed the directly relevant questions as set out below: Question 10: Our clients would prefer single use housing to attach to the site and dispute claims that the site is at flood risk, (Para 5.13 refers)
1655	4	Question 15: Our clients confirm that the site can be made available for development. They also confirm that commercial use has proven unviable and tenants almost impossible to attract. Moreover, such uses are unpopular with nearby residents who have expressed a preference for residential development. Additionally, residential traffic will find it easier to negotiate the difficult vehicular access over the Chesterfield Canal.
1656	1	The site at the former Dormer Tools site, Shireoaks Road has been assessed in terms of other potential housing allocations within the Issues and Options Paper and it is considered that the site is more suitable than a number of other sites. The allocation of this site will: Remove an employment site which is no longer suitable or marketable for employment generating uses; Locate residential development on a part brownfield, part greenfield site and located within the settlement boundary; Locate residential development within a sustainable location close to public transport networks and accessible to a number of local services and facilities; Deliver much needed housing to meet the required distribution for the settlement set out in the adopted Core Strategy.
1656	2	We agree that the methodology criteria set out in section 2 of the Site Allocations Issues and Options paper is suitable to identify sites for allocation for future development
1656	3	The 'screening approach' should be renamed to stop the confusion with 'screening opinion'. Not all criteria should be weighted the same and it should be recognised that some judgements are subjective and hence it will be for the decision maker to justify their approach by reference to the appropriate evidence base. The following table provides an assessment of site ref: 38 Dormer Tools, Shireoaks Road against the methodology criteria:
1656	4	1) Green. There is strong community support for the development of the site for the proposed use. This has been proven through the public consultation that has been carried out as part of application ref: 69/11/00012. The Parish Council did not consider it to be a future employment site.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1656	5	2) Green. Development is compatible with existing and proposed uses. Employment uses are located to the south of the site but these can be adequately screened and separated from the proposed residential dwellings. Other surrounding land uses include residential dwellings and woodlands. Residents of neighbouring area welcome the proposal. There will also be less impact on woodland than the former industrial use.
1656	6	3) Green. Development will lead to the delivery of economic development opportunities. The redevelopment of the site will lead to employment opportunities both during the build and the operation of the senior living1care home elements of the site. The site has been continuously marketed but all assessments by experienced commercial surveyors with local knowledge consider this to a secondary employment site.
1656	7	4) Green. No Impact on agricultural land. The site is a previously developed site located within the settlement boundary and its development will not impact on any agricultural land.
1656	8	5) Green. Not in a Source Protection Zone. Furthermore housing is generally considered by the Environment Agency as a polluting activity where as some employment uses present higher risk.
1656	9	6) Green. Site is in a 'create' landscape character zone.
1656	10	7) Development of the site is likely to enhance the existing built form. The site has previously been developed for a factory use. This has been demolished, but the hard standing remains. The redevelopment of this site for housing incorporating an area of open space will enhance the visual appearance of the site and contribute to the character of the area.
1656	11	8) Green. Development is likely to enhance the existing green infrastructure. The redevelopment of this site for housing including the provision of an area of public open space will enhance the existing green infrastructure and provide opportunities for local wildlife to integrate with the site from the woodlands to the north and east of the site.
1656	12	9) Green. The site has no existing constraints.
1656	13	The total housing growth target has been adjusted within the Adopted Core Strategy (2011) to account for the amount of housing development that has already taken place and the extension to the plan period following the Core Strategy examination. The housing target for the plan period for Worksop is now 2464 units (2006-2028) which gives an annual target of 112 units per year. The residual requirement for the remaining plan period is 1193 (2010-2028) (Adopted Core Strategy Table 4.1). Paragraph 4.2 of the Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation Paper also sets out this adjusted housing requirement for Worksop (including Shireoaks and Rhodesia) taking account of past completions, deliverable sites identified in the SHLAA and commencements giving a residual requirement of 1517 units. The 2011 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment identifies 2545 dwellings which are developable in the 6-10 year period of the plan, 1307 units in the 11-15 year period and 2532 in years 16+. The majority of this potential supply is on site ref: 4 an urban extension to the north east of Worksop which has a potential maximum capacity of 3000 dwellings. The figures provided in the 2011 SHLAA for deliverable sites within the first 5 years of the plan are 328 units. This is substantially less than the required 560 to meet the 5 year supply for Worksop. In fact this represents just over 3 years supply of land for the District's Sub-Regional Centre and demonstrates a serious shortfall of available land within Worksop given its prime focus for growth in the District. This shortfall will need to be compensated for within the later periods of the plan and it will mean that more housing growth will need to be accommodated to meet the 5 year supply during the whole of the plan period. It also suggests the current sites identified in the first 5 years in the SHLAA do not deliver the pattern of growth across the District required by the Core Strategy.
1656	14	While the Core Strategy suggests sustainable urban extensions, it is considered that some of this requirement could be met in the shorter term by the release of the site at the former Dormer Tools site, Shireoaks Road (ref: 38) which is in accordance with the emerging Core Strategy including Policy DM7 which accepts not all employment land is suitable for new employment uses. The recent marketing assessment of the site strongly suggests that this is not a site that should be continued to be protected for employment use. The allocation of sustainable sites located within the settlement boundary and on previously developed land should be favoured for development.
1656	15	The Site Allocation Issues and Options paper identifies 32 sites in Worksop as 'Potential Housing' with a total maximum capacity of 6253 units. 3 of these sites are identified as potential mixed use sites and 1 as a potential opportunity site. This level of housing clearly goes beyond the supply for the plan period and could not be accommodated without significant investment into additional infrastructure and services. Therefore the most suitable, deliverable and achievable sites within the SHLAA need to be selected in order to ensure the successful delivery of housing and employment growth on the most sequentially preferable sites. On consideration of each of the potential site allocations in order to determine the most suitable and achievable sites to deliver the housing requirement within the plan period it has been found that a number of sites are either; considered not suitable for housing and should be considered for other more suitable uses; can't be delivered during the plan period; or there are sequentially preferable sites within the settlement boundary to deliver the required housing supply.
1656	16	Although the Core Strategy does make provision for the boundaries of settlements to be changed in order to accommodate site allocations, it is considered that sites within the settlement boundary should be considered favourable to come forward over the plan period. Support is given for the allocation of those sites located within the settlement boundary. The majority of which are brownfield sites. A number of these sites would be allocations of less than 10 dwellings which is against best practice guidance. However, their location within the settlement boundary and providing small infill plots is favoured. These sites are refs: 23, 567, 568, 569 and 570 providing a total of 18 dwellings.
1656	17	<i>Site Ref: 38 and 21128 -Dormer Tools -Potential Housing and Potential Protected Open Space.</i> The development of these two sites for housing is supported as a preferred location for future housing. The site is currently a parcel of vacant land located within the settlement boundary of Worksop to the north west of Worksop town centre and to the east of the village of Shireoaks/Rhodesia. It is considered to be one of the more sustainable and deliverable sites within Worksop. It is important that the whole area is developed comprehensively as this provides the best opportunity to secure the integration of the open space into the development so that the new open space adds to rather than detracts from the attractiveness of the development as a whole. Such an approach will allow for the development to integrate with the more natural environment to the north and east.

Reference number		Answer
Response number	Comment	
1656	18	An outline planning application has been submitted (ref: 69/11 /00012) for up to a maximum of 80 dwellings and 72 residential care home/senior living units. (A copy of the application and supporting documents is enclosed on CD).
1656	19	The former factory units have been cleared and a land contamination survey has been carried out which concludes the site is satisfactory for residential development.
1656	20	The development proposal will deliver much needed housing which will be in keeping with the surrounding residential character of the area to the north west. The application site currently offers no amenity value and developing housing on the site will enhance the overall quality of the environment and provide a compatible land use.
1656	21	It is considered that when employment sites are no longer required for employment purposes and demand is no longer present for the re-use of poorer quality and unsuitable sites, then these sites should be re-used for more appropriate uses such as housing rather than stagnating the site.
1656	22	The Viability Assessment and the marketing information carried out as part of this application demonstrates the lack of demand for the application site for employment uses and the lack of viability in terms of providing new employment uses compared to providing housing on the site. It is therefore considered that the site should be released for housing development in accordance with the adopted Core Strategy Policy DM7 and the emerging National Planning Policy Framework.
1656	23	<i>Site Ref: 60 and 70.</i> Both of these smaller capacity sites are considered to have other preferred uses for either business or retail which are more suitable for the location and surrounding land uses and environment.
1656	24	<i>Site Ref: 348 and 374.</i> The redevelopment of these sites is supported given their locations. However, the delivery of both of these sites is uncertain as set out in the SHLAA site assessments and so their allocation would be futile.
1656	25	<i>Site Ref: 4. Mixed use site see below.</i>
1656	26	<i>Site Ref: 8.</i> The site is located on the edge of the settlement boundary to the north of Worksop, but would connect to existing residential development to the south and east. Access would need to be taken to the south of the site off Winster Grove which could reduce the potential capacity of the site given that this is taken through a small existing housing estate.
1656	27	<i>Site Ref: 9.</i> Access would need to be provided from Birchfield Drive and Westwood Drive as well as from Mansfield Road.
1656	28	Listed Building and Conservation Area would need to be considered.
1656	29	<i>Site Ref: 14.</i> Would require demolition of existing dwelling which land owner has bought in order to facilitate access of greater than 5 dwellings.
1656	30	<i>Site Ref: 28. Mixed use site see below.</i>
1656	31	<i>Site Ref: 153. Potential opportunity site.</i> Previously developed Brownfield site outside the settlement boundary. Agree with suggestion of limited housing, restaurant/public house and wildlife site/recreational space.
1656	32	<i>Site Ref: 561.</i> The majority of this site actually lies within the settlement boundary of Shireoaks. Development of housing in this location could be supported provided that the access arrangements and flood risk of the site can be adequately addressed.
1656	33	<i>Site Ref: 566.</i> Allocation of less than 10 so not in accordance with national guidance
1656	34	Site located on the edge of settlement boundary, but given capacity would be small infill within an existing residential area, this could be supported.
1656	35	<i>Site Ref: 587:</i> Potential Opportunity site. Previously developed Brownfield site outside the settlement boundary. Agree with limited housing to connect to site ref: 153. Access to Shireoaks including footpath links. Overlooking the Chesterfield Canal and marina.
1656	36	The above preferred edge of settlement sites which consist of brownfield land give a total of 233 units. Added to those located within the settlement at 98 units brings the total preferred capacity of future housing supply for Worksop to 331 units. This figure is well below the 1517 units required in the Site Allocations paper. Therefore, greenfield sites will need to be released in order to meet the requirement set out in the Core Strategy.
1656	37	It is agreed that the redevelopment of an existing site such as Dormer Tools should be allowed to come forward for development as soon as possible as all these edge of settlement sites will have a larger timeframe. The Council should however, take serious consideration of likely completion rates on each site. Our experience would suggest that higher level of completions to meet the housing needs of the area can be achieved by bringing forward a selection of sites of various sizes and locations. Given the present undersupply of sites in Worksop to meet the Core Strategy, considerable weight should be given to such an approach.
1656	38	<i>Site ref: W1 – Land South of A57.</i> This site is grade 3 agricultural land and the availability of this land is currently unknown.
1656	39	However, the site is in close proximity to the A57 and is therefore commercially attractive. It is certainly preferable in market terms to site ref: 38.
1656	40	<i>Site Ref: W6 – Land at Gateford Common</i> This site forms part of the mixed use site at Gateford Road and Claylands Avenue. The site is currently in agricultural use and lies adjacent to residential development to the east and employment uses to the south.
1656	41	The site is in close proximity to the A57 and has been identified as commercially attractive.
1656	42	The delivery of this site depends on facilitating adequate access.
1656	43	<i>Site Ref: W8 – Land at Shireoaks Common.</i> This site is also a potential mixed use site located on the edge of the village of Shireoaks. The land is bound on the eastern side by the A57. Part of the site to the north western corner has been identified as lying within flood zone 2.
1656	44	There are potential issues relating to access off the A57 which would need to be addressed.
1656	45	Prominent location along this transport corridor makes this site commercially all active as an employment site.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1656	46	<i>Site Ref: W9 – Land at Kilton Golf Club. The site forms a potential mixed use site to the eastern edge of Worksop. The preferred option for this site would be a mix of employment (27ha) and housing (700 dwellings) as shown in option 3 within the site allocations paper. This site is considered in more detail below.</i>
1656	47	<i>Site Ref: W10 – Land at Peppers Warehousing, Blyth Road.</i> This site is located on the edge of the settlement to the north east of Worksop and is being considered in the Site Allocation paper as a potential mixed use site. Development of the site would result in the loss of grade 3 agricultural land.
1656	48	The option shown for the split of housing and employment uses ensures that the employment is located to the far north of the site and relates to the existing Peppers Warehousing units.
1656	49	<i>Site Ref: W12 – Land South of A57</i> Part of this site is brownfield land associated with the colliery. The site is also adjacent to Manton Wood Business Park (former Enterprise Zone) on the former colliery site.
1656	50	To the west and over the A57 to the north there is a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and land to the south is also designated as a LWS which forms the hinterland of Sherwood Forest.
1656	51	<i>Site Ref: W13 – Land off Stubbing Lane:</i> This site is currently in agricultural use and lies adjacent to the roundabout where the A57 and A60 meet. The site is also located in close proximity to the industrial units at Sandy Lane.
1656	52	The southern edges of the site lies within flood zone 3b with flood risk gradually decreasing away from the river banks to zones 3a and 2. The northern parts of the site are in flood zone 1.
1656	53	<i>Site Ref: 4 – Kilton – Potential Mixed Use Site.</i> The SHLAA site assessment identifies this site as maybe suitable for development, maybe achievable and maybe available. The site is currently sports pitches, agriculture, woodlands, elements of residential and a golf course/club house and is located on the edge of the settlement. The site lies adjacent to a Conservation Area with archaeological interest.
1656	54	The redevelopment of this site would require major junction and highways infrastructure and the current uses of the site may prevent the whole of the site being developed for either housing, employment or mixed use.
1656	55	A number of options are presented in the Site Allocations document and the preferred option of this urban extension to Worksop is Option 3 providing a small mixed use site comprising of 56% housing (700 houses) and 44% employment land (27ha). This would provide the much needed housing for Worksop and is realistic within the plan period.
1656	56	The full capacity of the site is considered to be too large to attract a single developer and would need to be phased over the plan period, which cannot be guaranteed.
1656	57	Option 1 would extend beyond the plan period and given the requirement to maintain open space it would be preferable to see a small area of this site developed in combination with other available and suitable sites within the settlement boundary.
1656	58	<i>Site Ref: 28 – Gateford Common.</i> The use of this site for a mix of housing and employment would be preferred given the neighbouring employment uses to the south of the site dependent on adequate separation and boundary treatment.
1656	59	The residential element would connect well to the existing residential development to the east and employment uses would be preferred to the south.
1656	60	<i>Site Ref: 2/128 –</i> This representation seeks to object to the protection of open space ref: 2/128 located to the south of the former Dormer Tools site, Shireoaks Road, Worksop (site ref: 38). With regard to the currently pending outline planning application ref: 69/11/00012, public consultation with the local residents and Parish Council was carried out. Feedback from this consultation concluded that an open space option within any future proposal for the site was dismissed due to the lack of demand for such a facility in Rhodesia and no interest from an end user. As a result the scheme sought to provide a 'village green' area of open space within the centre of the site and additional landscaping throughout.
1656	61	Rhodesia already has a playing field which the Parish Council look after and they would not be looking for any further provision for them to maintain.
1656	62	By isolating this part of the site this unused green space will remain poorly integrated with any future housing development and as such represents a missed opportunity in terms of the future planning of this site.
1656	63	Site Accessibility: Busy roads – The majority of Shireoaks population would have to travel along busy roads to reach this site.
1656	64	Restrictive entrances – The site is within a derelict area and presently difficult to access
1656	65	Isolated locations – The site is presently isolated from existing residential locations by the derelict land surrounding it.
1656	66	Insufficient paths into and across the space – There are no public footpaths to the site.
1656	67	Other barriers identified – The site is wholly within a private estate therefore no public access
1656	68	Safety and security: Secure boundaries – The site has no secure boundaries.
1656	69	Safety surface – The site has no safety surface.
1656	70	CCTV – The site has no CCTV
1656	71	Located within the residential area or adjacent to its border – The site is not presently located in or adjacent to a residential area.
1656	72	Overlooked throughout – The site is not overlooked at all.
1656	73	Additional criteria: Site quality – The site is of poor quality.
1656	74	Context of the site in relation to other open space – The site relates poorly to the natural woodland beyond the derelict site.
1656	75	Structural and landscape benefits – The site has no landscape or structural benefits.
1656	76	Ecological benefits – the site is not designated.
1656	77	Educational benefits – the site has no educational benefits
1656	78	Social inclusion and health benefits – the site has no Social inclusion and health benefits

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1656	79	Cultural heritage benefits – the site has no cultural benefits
1656	80	Amenity benefit and sense of place – the site has no amenity benefit
1656	81	Economic benefits – the site has no economic benefits
1656	82	When assessed against the Council's own assessment criteria with respect to value, the site scores poorly, particularly against the accessibility criteria and the additional criteria particularly given the barrier to access, lack of overlooking and poor site quality due to lack of maintenance. It is therefore considered that this parcel of land should be removed from the area of potential protected greenspace identified as 2/128 since it is not considered to form a usable open space function.
1657	1	The site has previously been assessed as part of the Council's SHLAA exercise and identified as being suitable for housing under reference BAS0236.
1657	2	Owing to its limited size, the Council's final SHLAA concluded that the site should be brought forward as part of the adjacent, much larger, site to the east (site reference: BAS0237). However, it is clear that the adjacent site (BAS0237) is far too large given the limited number of new dwellings earmarked for the village by way of the Issues and Options Consultation Paper. Instead, the owner of site BAS0236 has approached his neighbour immediately to the west, to jointly promote an extended version of his site (still to be referred to as site reference BAS0236) for consideration as one of the Council's preferred housing sites for North and South Wheatley in the subsequent consultation stages of the Site Allocations DPD.
1657	3	I can confirm that I am jointly instructed by both landowners and therefore the fact that the proposed allocation is in 2 separate ownerships should not be considered a factor in its delivery, other than a positive one. If allocated, both landowners will make the combined site immediately available for development.
1657	4	Site BAS0236 is currently in agricultural use. The land immediately adjacent to the west is (as is confirmed in the Council's final SHLAA) in 'wider residential use' comprising a former paddock which is used by the owner of 'Whitegates' as additional amenity land and cut twice a year.
1657	5	Access for maintenance is presently provided through Site BAS0236 and therefore there is further logic in both sites being combined for development in that should site BAS0236 be developed in isolation, the paddock land to the rear of 'Whitegates' would effectively be landlocked.
1657	6	Both parcels of land immediately adjoin the existing village boundary. The western and northern boundaries to both are particularly strong, being defined by mature tree and hedgerow planting and this would provide a long term defensible limit to the settlement.
1657	7	The paddock also benefits from a continuous hedgerow along its eastern boundary. Any small scale housing development would seek to integrate as much of this as possible into the layout design.
1657	8	Access would be provided directly off Top Pasture Lane. Visibility can be provided in both directions in accordance with the requirements of Manual for Streets.
1657	9	For the most part, the Council's suggested 'Screening Methodology' is supported and considered to provide a sound and logical basis upon which to select the final sites to be allocated for development.
1657	10	Our only concern relates to the potential application of Criterion 1. In our experience, new housing development is very rarely 'supported' by the local community; particularly when this involves the take up of greenfield land – something which the Council recognises[1] must occur if the District's future housing and employment land requirements are to be met. Clearly, the Localism Agenda will play an increasingly important part in the modern planning system; however the Council must ensure that account is taken of local views only where these are based on valid planning grounds.
1657	11	In the above connection, it will fall on the Council in subsequent consultation stages of the Site Allocations DPD to explain how (and on what basis) the views of the local community have been used to assist in the choice of some sites over others.
1657	12	Such is the importance of creating and protecting sustainable rural communities in what is a predominantly rural District, it is considered essential that rural housing is delivered in line with the levels of distribution envisaged in the Core Strategy, particularly if additional facilities, infrastructure improvements and affordable/local housing is to be provided where the need arises. Accordingly, the redistribution of housing away from the Rural Service Centres and towards Worksop, Retford and Harworth Bircotes (or alternatively focussed in just one of these towns) is not supported.
1657	13	We are strongly of the view that at least 12 new houses should be allocated for the villages of North and South Wheatley collectively and therefore fully support the level of new residential development suggested in the Consultation Paper.
1657	14	The village benefits from a number of local services and facilities which require long term support from the local community. The village is extremely proud of its Post Office and village store which were taken on by one of the local residents when faced with closure.
1657	15	Creating and safeguarding sustainable rural communities are considered to be of paramount importance. Such objectives can only realistically be achieved through a limited amount of new housing growth. Without growth, the village could simply stagnate with dire consequences for many of the local facilities and residents.
1657	16	12 new houses over the next Plan period – i.e. up to 2028 represents less than 1 new house per year and therefore such a level cannot be considered too high.
1657	17	It is understood that some local residents have expressed a wish to see additional facilities, infrastructure improvements etc. However, it must be acknowledged that the CIL receipts and/or S106 agreements can only deliver such through new housing allocated in the Village. As recognised in the Consultation Paper, such facilities are unlikely to be provided if no development takes place.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1657	18	Our preferred housing allocation is Site BAS0236 as extended by the immediately adjoining paddock to the west. For the avoidance of any doubt, please find enclosed location plan showing the extent of the proposed allocation edged red. It is considered that a meaningful level of new housing development could be easily accommodated on this combined site with little if any impact on the village and wider landscape setting – i.e. it is not affected by the Conservation Area boundary which extends beyond the settlement limits to the west and to the south as a means of preserving the setting of North and South Wheatley from these directions. The suitability of the site is further endorsed when applying the nine criteria comprising the Council's 'Screening Methodology' below:
1657	19	Criteria 1. The landowners have informally consulted members of the village community to gauge local reaction to the two sites being joined for development purposes. Those approached have been happy to support the site for small-scale housing development and I understand some will have written direct to the Council confirming the same. In the above connection, there is presently evidence of some of the local community being supportive of the development of the site.
1657	20	Criteria 2. The site(s) will be collectively developed to contribute towards meeting the Council's requirement for at least 12 new houses for the village. The site immediately adjoins existing residential development and wider domestic curtilages to the north and west and will therefore be compatible with existing/neighbouring land uses.
1657	21	Criterion 3. Assisting in meeting the Council's housing target of 12 new dwellings will help to support and safeguard existing local services and facilities, in particular the Post Office, village store, and public house etc. Such facilities are vital to the future of sustainable rural communities, but also provide local employment opportunities to all ages.
1657	22	Criterion 4. By combining with non-agricultural land to the west, rather than the larger agricultural field to the east, the allocation of the site subject of these representations will avoid the best and most versatile agricultural land being needlessly lost to development.
1657	23	Criterion 5. The site will not impact on a source protection zone.
1657	24	Criterion 6. The combined site is extremely well contained by existing mature tree and hedgerow planting along its north and western boundaries and relates more logically to the existing built character of the village than to the countryside beyond (also Criterion 7).
1657	25	The eastern boundary of the paddock to the rear of Whitegates is also particularly strong and it is envisaged that it will for the most part be retained in any residential layout.
1657	26	Whilst the eastern boundary of the original site BAS0236 is no longer present (it having been removed as part of more modern agricultural practices), there is the opportunity to reinstate this historical field boundary with a new native hedgerow species which can only serve to enhance the landscape character.
1657	27	The allocation of this site together with other smaller sites to contribute towards the minimum 12 new dwellings avoids the need to release some of the larger agricultural fields for development which, it is submitted, if developed would have a much greater impact on the landscape character of the area.
1657	28	Criterion 7. There is sufficient width to the land to enable the siting of up to 2 dwellings fronting Top Pasture Lane, thereby preserving the character of development along this part of the village, together with space for a new private driveway to serve a number of dwellings on land to the rear.
1657	29	The site falls outside of the Conservation Area boundary defined for the village and is therefore free of some of the conservation and heritage constraints that at least one of the other proposed allocations will be subject to. The take up of site BAS0236 in favour of a site which falls within the Conservation Area, i.e. one which contributes to the setting of the village, is considered to be preferable in terms of enhancing rather than detracting from the existing built character of the settlement.
1657	30	Criterion 8. The retention of existing hedgerows and the reinstatement of an historical field boundary along the entire eastern length of site BAS0236 will serve to enhance the existing green infrastructure of the settlement by the introduction of native habitats which will offer important ecological and biodiversity benefits.
1657	31	Criterion 9. The SHLAA identifies that the western half of the site is identified as an area of archaeological interest. In this connection, it is expected that an archaeological watching brief would simply be required to be in place prior to the commencement of any development should the site ultimately be allocated for housing.
1657	32	Any proposed development on the site will need to ensure that the surface water runoff rate does not exceed the existing greenfield run-off rate.
1657	33	There is sufficient room to accommodate a 2m x 43m visibility splay to provide a satisfactory means of access to serve the site direct off Top Pasture Lane.
1657	34	Those sites shown on the map as potential Protected Open Space designations are considered to contribute to the quality and value of open spaces in the Village and therefore their protection from future development pressure is supported.
1657	35	I would be obliged if these matters could be given thorough consideration in your further preparation of the Site Allocations DPD and confirm that I wish to continue to be kept apprised of progress and to have the opportunity to advocate the relevant representations through the Examination in Public procedure if necessary.
1658	1	Representations The two parcels of land are owned by two willing landowners and comprise agricultural land that abuts the settlement boundary to the east of Retford. The land to the north of Grove Coach Road extends to approximately 6.3ha and the land to the south of Grove Coach Road extends to approximately 3.6ha. Both sites are being promoted together as part of a comprehensive scheme, although each can be developed individually. Whilst my client has not until now promoted either site themselves, Chesterton Humber's have, on the landowners' behalf, previously put forward both sites as part of the Council's formal SHLAA process (site references 370 and 51). Copies of the Council's SHLAA Assessments are enclosed with this letter for ease of reference.
1658	2	The SHLAA identifies the site to the north of Grove Coach Road (SHLAA site ref: 511) as being suitable for housing development and suggests this could accommodate 158 dwellings based on 80% of the gross area (6.57ha) at a density of 30 dwellings per hectare. The assessment considers there to be no known constraints which would prevent the site from being suitable for housing development providing the highway requirements can be met.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1658	3	The SHLAA identifies the site to the south of Grove Coach Road (SHLAA site ref: 370) as potentially suitable for housing development, which could accommodate 96 dwellings based on 90% of the gross area (3.65ha) at a density of 30 dwellings per hectare. However, this is subject to the identified constraints being addressed, which include issues regarding highways and drainage. Nonetheless, the issues identified within the SHLAA by the Council should not preclude the allocation of the land for housing as these issues can and would be resolved during the detailed planning application stage. In this respect, I address each identified issue in turn below.
1658	4	Highways. The Council identified that Grove Coach Road would require significant improvement in its width to provide adequate access and footways so that site ref 370 could be accessed. In this respect, the Council suggest that a section 106 or CIL contribution is likely to be sought to enable mitigation of the traffic implications. Similarly, Bracken Lane would need to be improved so site ref 511 could be accessed. However, the comments made by the Council in this regard state that there is no objection in principle. Accordingly, the issues identified for both sites would not affect the deliverability of the sites because they can be overcome within the detailed planning application via section 106 or CIL contributions and appropriate highway design.
1658	5	Flood risk and drainage. Both sites are identified as being within Flood Zone 1 and therefore comprise land that does not have a risk of river or sea flooding. However, both sites are over 1 hectare and therefore a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) would be required at the detailed planning application stage to evaluate surface water drainage and provide any mitigation, if required. When allocating land in DPDs, a Sequential Test should be applied by the local planning authority to demonstrate there are no reasonably available sites in areas with a lower probability of flooding that would be appropriate to the type of development or land use proposed. In this respect, preference should be given to locating most vulnerable development, i.e. residential uses, in Flood Zone1. Accordingly, the allocation of my client's land for housing would be a compatible use and would be sequentially more preferable over other potential housing sites put forward in the Site Allocations Issues and Options consultation document that are partially within Flood Zones 2 and 3.
1658	6	In addition, the land to the south of Grove Coach Road is also identified as having 'possible drainage problems' however no other detail is expressed within the SHLAA form. Any possible drainage problems would be evaluated as part of the FRA and an appropriate sustainable urban drainage system incorporated into the design of the proposal to ensure green run-off rates are maintained and no further drainage issues arise off-site. With regard to the above information, the issues concerning flood risk and drainage can be dealt with by means of an appropriately designed layout including the appropriate application of sustainable urban drainage techniques. It is therefore respectfully submitted that my client's land should be identified as preferred housing allocations for Retford within the Site Allocations DPD because there are no identified constraints that would prevent the suitability and deliverability of the development.
1658	7	We support the criteria in the Screening Methodology.
1658	8	However, it is considered that criterion I, which refers to whether the local community is supportive of the development of the site, should be further defined. The Council considers public opinion to be a fundamental consideration in the site allocation process, in line with the new Localism Act 2011. However, the Council should be more explicit within the main text of the Preferred Options Report that it is not only the number of people in support/against the development of the site but also the appropriateness of the opinion within the planning context. A recent study by the National Centre for Social Research found that 45% of respondents oppose new homes being built in their local area. In this respect, the Council need to be made aware of the rational planning reasons that provide the material justification to supporting or opposing the development of a site.
1658	9	Retford is identified as a Core Service Centre within the Bassetlaw Core Strategy (to be adopted on 22 December 2011) with a number of facilities and services. The Core Strategy sets a minimum : housing requirement of at least 26% for Retford. This therefore allows for more growth above and beyond the minimum target set for Retford. Accordingly, additional housing allocations which exceed the minimum requirement are and should be allowed to ensure there is sufficient housing land within Retford to support its growth as a Core Service Centre. This would also improve the effectiveness of the DPD by instilling flexibility to cope with any change in circumstances throughout the plan period and thereby making the DPD sound.
1658	10	We would prefer site 370 and site 511 to be developed for housing in the future. The following is a brief assessment of the land when set against the criteria the Council will be using to further assess the sites which will then be put forward within the Preferred Options Report. However, criterion 1 has not been addressed within this letter of representation as the public opinion will of course no doubt be provided through the current and forthcoming public consultation process.
1658	11	The allocation of both sites for housing would provide a logical extension to the existing residential area to the east of Retford which it already abuts. Any proposed residential development on the sites would seek to safeguard the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties through appropriate contextual design. The proposed housing allocation would therefore be compatible with this neighbouring residential land use. Accordingly, the Council should classify both sites as having a 'green light' as the development would clearly be compatible with existing and proposed uses.
1658	12	Although the sites are not being promoted for an overt economic use, the allocation of housing at the sites will indirectly enable economic growth through the investment by a housing developer into the area which will create construction jobs and appropriate housing types within a popular residential area ensuring that Retford continues to be a vibrant and attractive place to live and work. Accordingly, Council should classify both sites as having a 'green light' as the development would lead to the delivery of economic development opportunities.
1658	13	The urban boundary of Retford is surrounded by Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land. To the east of Retford, where the sites fall within, the land is identified as Grade 3 agricultural land. Accordingly, the Council should classify both sites as having an 'amber light' because the development will only impact on grade 3 agricultural land.
1658	14	The allocation of the land for housing would not impact on any groundwater sources as residential development would not be considered to be a polluting activity. In addition, both parcels of land fall outside the groundwater source protection zone identified by the Environment Agency.
1658	15	It is important to note that this land including the immediate surrounding area is the only part of Retford that is not covered by a groundwater source protection zone. Accordingly, the Council should classify both sites as having a 'green light' because the sites are not in a Source Protection Zone.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1658	16	The Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (2009) identifies the sites as falling within Policy Zone 04: Clarbrough of the Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands county character area. The landscape action for the policy zone is to conserve. Policy Zone 04 recognises the landform within this area as being strongly undulating that descends steeply in the west towards the Chesterfield Canal and Retford. In addition, views are relatively open to surrounding landscape and wooded skylines from higher ground, becoming more restricted by topography and scattered woodlands in lower lying parts. The sites are generally located on low lying land adjacent to the existing built form of Retford with little visual screening to segregate the two and therefore any additional development adjacent to this area would be seen within this existing confined urban context. Subsequently, the open rural character of the policy zone landscape would be conserved by concentrating new development on the edge of the settlement. The proposed development would also seek to enhance the existing Green Infrastructure as described in the response to criterion 8 and, alongside an appropriate landscaping scheme, would therefore seek to conserve and/or enhance the landscape features associated with this policy zone. Accordingly, the Council should classify both sites as having an 'amber light' because the development would be seen within the existing urban context and any proposal would seek to mediate and enhance the landscape features as much as possible.
1658	17	The development would seek to conserve and/or enhance the existing built character of the settlement or neighbourhood through careful consideration of the existing built form within the design of the new development as part of a detailed planning application, following the allocation of the sites. Accordingly, the Council should classify both sites as having a 'green light' because the development of the sites is likely to enhance the existing built form.
1658	18	The Green Infrastructure Study (May 2010) identified the area to the east of Retford as the most prominent and strategic area of deficiency, particularly relating to connectivity, within Bassetlaw's existing green infrastructure network. The document continues to highlight that the connectivity needs of the area can be addressed by upgrading footpaths, promoting new recreational routes between existing nodes and settlements, and encouraging hedgerow management in order to enhance wildlife migration routes and overall biodiversity levels. Both sites are on the edge of the existing built form to the east of Retford and therefore fall within this area of deficiency. The allocation of the sites for housing could therefore help to alleviate this deficiency (within the design of the scheme submitted as part of a detailed planning application following allocation) through the enhancement of existing footpaths and recreational routes to promote greater integration of the new development along the urban fringe with major nodes such as Treswell Wood to the east and Gamston and Eaton Woods to the south east. Accordingly, the Council should classify both sites as having a 'green light' because the development of the sites is likely to enhance existing Green Infrastructure.
1658	19	As detailed above, the constraints identified by the Council within the SHLAA can be resolved through appropriate mitigation and would not affect the suitability or the deliverability of the site as a housing allocation. Accordingly, the Council should classify both sites as having an 'amber light' because the sites have some constraints, which can be resolved.
1658	20	We would not support the redevelopment of the sites which fall within Flood Zone 2 for residential purposes as there are considered to be sequentially more preferable sites adjacent to the settlement boundary of Retford that fall within Flood Zone 1.
1658	21	We support 'Option B' and suggest that any additional growth should be focused in Retford.
1659	1	My client owns the majority of the land edged red on the attached plan comprising land and buildings on the west side of West Carr Road, Retford. It is acknowledged that part of the site is presently in employment use, however my client's business is looking into the feasibility of relocating, I note a number of other sites comprising part of the same wider employment designation have been put forward/identified as part of the earlier SHLAA exercise -namely site references 25, 71, 132 and 133. For ease of reference, the site subject of this representation is shown edged red on an extract of the Council's own SHLAA plan to provide context.
1659	2	It is noted that sites 132 and 133 have automatically been discounted as part of the SHLAA exercise owing to the existing employment use designation. The SHLAA Assessment records that the landowner(s) in respect of both sites is unknown and this may have had a bearing on the Council's approach to deliverability and therefore overall suitability.
1659	3	Site 71 has been considered ' <i>potentially suitable</i> ' as part of the SHLAA exercise and there is no mention of the same protected employment site policy constraint as was raised in relation to sites 132 and 133, notwithstanding the fact that all four sites fall within the same designation as confirmed by reference to the Local Plan Proposals Map. When considering the principle of residential development on site 71 at appeal within the context of PPS3 (using land efficiently being a key consideration in planning for housing), Inspector J Woodcock concluded ' <i>there is nothing in the evidence adduced to justify rejecting the proposed development on the grounds of safeguarding employment land</i> '. In the above connection, site 71 has of course now been identified as a potential housing site in the Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation Paper.
1659	4	Similarly, the SHLAA Assessment for site 25 also concludes that this site may be suitable for housing notwithstanding surrounding employment uses – however, as some of these uses are offices, there may be scope for some housing development on the site. Again, there is no reference to conflict with the protected employment site policy as was the case for sites 132 and 133.
1659	5	You will see from the attached plan that the site my client wishes to promote effectively consolidates the northern half of the existing employment site, enabling this and site 25 to be redeveloped for housing whilst retaining the southern half to continue to provide local employment opportunities in addition to the number of other protected employment sites serving Retford. My client therefore wishes the Council to consider the inclusion of this site for housing in conjunction with sites 25 and 71 within the context of the emerging SA DPD.
1659	6	Within the context of all the above, my client would support the development of site 71 for housing, in conjunction with his own site 25, as part of a more comprehensive residential development scheme.
1660	1	Please find below our formal representations on the above consultation document which are submitted on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Limited. These representations should be read <i>alongside</i> the enclosed 'Advocacy Document' prepared by John R <i>Paley</i> Associates on behalf of Taylor Wimpey which is submitted in support of the view that the proposed mixed-use development site is both suitable and deliverable. Taylor Wimpey UK Limited have recently secured their interest in land at Blyth Road, Worksop to pursue the site as a mixed-use allocation comprising residential and employment development through the Council's remaining consultation stages of the Site Allocations DPD.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1660	2	The site has previously been promoted by the longstanding local landowners, Messrs J and M Pepper in response to the Council's ' <i>call for sites</i> ' and has been identified as being 'suitable' for housing development in the Council's original and subsequent 'final' Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) assessments under site reference 39. The site has also previously been identified in the Council's Employment Land Capacity Study (ELCS) as being suitable and achievable under site reference W10.
1660	3	For the most part, the Council's suggested 'Screening Methodology' is supported and considered to provide a sound and logical basis upon which to select the final sites to be allocated for development.
1660	4	Our only concern relates to the potential application of <i>Criterion 1</i> . In our experience, new development is very rarely 'supported' by the local community; particularly when this involves the take up of greenfield land -something which the Council recognises] must occur if the District's future housing and employment land requirements are to be met. Clearly, the Localism Agenda will play an increasingly important part in the modern planning system; however the Council must ensure that account is taken of local views only where these are based on valid planning grounds. In the above connection, it will fall on the Council in subsequent consultation stages of the Site Allocations DPD to explain how (and on what basis) the views of the local community have been used to assist in the choice of some sites over others.
1660	5	Overall levels of housing and employment growth across the District have of course already been set following the Council's recent adoption of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy establishes a minimum residual housing requirement for approximately 1,386 dwellings and a residual employment requirement of 46.88 hectares and this level was generally supported by ourselves during the earlier consultation stages of that DPD. As the primary town within Bassetlaw and as the sole Principal Urban Area, it is right that Worksop is the focus for major housing and employment growth.
1660	6	However, it is equally important that additional growth over and above this level is not unnecessarily channelled towards Worksop (or indeed, towards any of the District's other town's and large villages) at the expense of limited but nevertheless worthwhile development in some of the District's smaller Rural Service Centres which will depend on such to sustain important local services and communities and provide the much needed impetus for the delivery of affordable housing as and where the need arises.
1660	7	Housing figures are never an exact science; however it is expected that Neighbourhood Plans (and the 'minimum' requirement set in the Core Strategy) could provide some flexibility over numbers if additional growth was required in Worksop at some future point to deliver specific and significant local benefits.
1660	8	The Council advocates allocating more employment land than is identified to be required in the ELCS in order to provide choice and flexibility (and ultimately delivery) of job -creating development. When dealing with the allocation of new employment sites, consideration should be given as to the likely delivery of new individual employment sites within the Plan period and if and how delivery could be secured on the various proposed mixed-use sites.
1660	9	Our preferred housing site is Land West of Blyth Road, Worksop identified on the map and in the Council's final SHLAA as 'site reference 39' which is promoted as a mixed- use allocation in combination with 'site reference W10'. Please refer to detailed response to Question 5 for further information.
1660	10	Our preferred employment site is Land West of Blyth Road, Worksop identified on the map and in the Council's Employment Land Capacity Study as 'site reference W10' which is promoted as a mixed-use allocation in combination with 'site reference 39'. Please refer to detailed response to Question 5 for further information.
1660	11	Our preferred mixed-use site is Land West of Blyth Road, Worksop identified on the map as 'site reference 39/W10'. The Council's final SHLAA concludes that the site is suitable for housing as it is adjacent the existing built form of Worksop and there are no known constraints which would prevent it from being developed.
1660	12	The original SHLAA expressed some concern regarding the compatibility of the proposed residential use with the existing employment use to the north. However, as a mixed-use scheme, such concerns have been allayed and the final SHLAA concludes that the proposed uses could easily be accommodated on the site. This site (and a proposed housing/employment split) is also schematically drawn on Figure 4.6 of the consultation document and briefly described in paragraph 4.12 of the same document.
1660	13	This permission extends the dynamic curtilage of the existing employment site to the northwest. This also coincides with the western boundary of the proposed mixed-use allocation ² and adds further logic to this land being considered as one which ought to comprise one of the Council's preferred extensions to the development boundary. Such logic is not at all presently conveyed by Figure 4.6 owing to the map stopping somewhat short of the existing employment site. In this connection, it would be helpful if the map could be extended to show the adjacent existing employment site to the north in any subsequent consultation document.
1660	14	The reference to the consequence of planning permission 59/11/00005 on the residual requirements for employment land in Worksop is queried as the application site area was approximately 4 hectares (and not 12 hectares as suggested).
1660	15	Figure 4.6 shows a potential split between housing and employment of which 70% is housing (around 270 houses) and 30% is employment land (5.5 hectares). However, Taylor Wimpey UK Limited has in discussions with the Council previously expressed a willingness and commitment to deliver 300 houses on this site at a rate of 30 dwellings per year.
1660	16	Whilst a consequence of this would be a slightly smaller area proposed for employment purposes, the type of employment land to be delivered on the site is expected to be better quality, more job generative and suited to small indigenous companies closely aligned to and associated with the existing Distribution Centre who have been a hugely important local employer in the Town over the past 20 years or so than warehouse development previously tabled.
1660	17	The split shown in Figure 4.6 appears to be broadly based on an illustrative masterplan previously prepared by Taylor Wimpey UK Limited's architect for discussion purposes with the Council. This layout has since been further refined and is now formally submitted in support of the promotion of site 39/W10 as a mixed use site as part of the enclosed Advocacy Document prepared by John R Paley Associates. This document provides a brief summary of these representations, but also provides a more detailed commentary of the various factors which have influenced the overall design and layout of the site ('the design evolution'), including reference to an updated masterplan and landscape strategy.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1660	18	<i>Criteria 1:</i> In the absence of any feedback yet generated by way of this consultation document, it is not considered appropriate to apply the traffic light system for <i>Criterion 1</i> at this point. Whilst Taylor Wimpey UK Limited has not yet held its own independent consultation with local communities to gauge support for the development of the site, this is something they have successfully undertaken elsewhere and would be prepared to approach the design and layout of the site in a suitably flexible manner so as to be able to be receptive to any comments or suggestions which may be forthcoming from local residents.
1660	19	<i>Criteria 2:</i> The residential element of the mixed-use allocation will be directed to the south of the site closest to the existing residential area forming the current limits to the development boundary. A significant portion of this area of land is already in residential use comprising a detached house and extensive domestic curtilage known locally as ' <i>Thievesdale House</i> '.
1660	20	As mentioned previously, earlier concerns raised in the original SHLAA with regard to the compatibility between the proposed residential use and the existing employment use to the use has been satisfactorily addressed owing to the employment element of the mixed-use allocation serving as buffer development between the existing Distribution Centre development and the proposed new housing.
1660	21	<i>Criterion 3:</i> The site is promoted as a mixed-use allocation and will therefore clearly help to deliver economic development opportunities. The employment element of the proposed mixed-use allocation will comprise good quality office and start-up premises closely aligned to and associated with the existing Distribution Centre.
1660	22	The existing Distribution Centre is committed to sustainable growth and has been approached by several of its B8 tenants for ancillary office space which the site presently cannot facilitate. The Distribution Centre is confident from the number and variety of enquiries received over the last 12 months that it could secure office-based tenants on the site had it had such premises to offer. There is something of a ' <i>chicken and egg</i> ' situation whereby existing tenants will not commit in such a way that the Distribution Centre could secure finance to build additional premises. The residential element of the proposed mixed-use development would enable the Distribution Centre to construct appropriately sized new office premises without reliance on bank intervention. In the above connection there is a real opportunity to provide and deliver office development allied and/or associated with the adjoining existing warehouse operation, as well as start-up business premises drawing investment in from surrounding areas and servicing small indigenous companies and responding to the needs of those companies already benefitting from the existing warehouse facilities who have expressed an appetite for onward investment and sustainable growth.
1660	23	The housing element of the mixed-use allocation will assist in meeting the above objectives by providing the financial impetus as a consequence of the implementation of the Phase I residential development. Since the issue of delivery of job-creating development is of paramount importance to the District, Taylor Wimpey UK Limited are happy for the delivery of a meaningful proportion of the employment element to be required prior to the implementation of the Phase II residential development, thereby ensuring delivery of job-creating development within the Plan period as forecast and required. The above clearly demonstrates the potential for the site to deliver economic development opportunities and should therefore be afforded a 'green light' when assessed against <i>Criterion 3</i> .
1660	24	It is considered that this site differs materially from those employment allocations which are promoted on a purely speculative basis and those existing good quality employment sites ³ where the proposed housing and mixed-use allocations will inevitably result in the loss of a good quality economic development site either in whole or in part.
1660	25	<i>Criterion 4:</i> Reference to Natural England's Agricultural Land Classification map confirms that the majority of agricultural land to the north and east of Work sop is classed as Grade 3 land.
1660	26	Indeed, all but two sites presently identified in the consultation document as potentially suitable for a housing or mixed-used allocation appear to fall within the same agricultural land classification and therefore perform no better (or worse) than others.
1660	27	Sites 9 and 30 however appear to be classed as Grade 2 land and therefore ought to be considered less suitable -i.e. a red light for the purpose of this criterion.
1660	28	Paragraph 2.32 of the consultation document confirms that information is not available to differentiate between Grades 3a and 3b in Bassetlaw and therefore the Council's assessment of sites against this criterion will consider all Grade 3 sites as being of the same quality unless evidence to make this distinction is provided. In this connection, Taylor Wimpey UK Limited intends to undertake a more detailed assessment of the agricultural land to seek to clarify whether it falls more specifically into Grade 3a or Grade 3b.
1660	29	On this basis, the site should be afforded an 'amber light' when assessed against <i>Criterion 4</i> , as will no doubt all other sites that have been put forward as part of this consultation process.
1660	30	<i>Criterion 5:</i> Paragraph 2.34 confirms that the majority of Bassetlaw's major settlements are in a Source Protection Zone. It is perhaps not surprising that all of the sites identified in the consultation document appear to be affected by the catchment to the source protection zone. Paragraph 2.35 confirms that housing is not generally considered by the Environment Agency as a polluting activity whereas some employment uses, such as industrial developments, present as higher risk. It further clarifies that the closer to an extraction point (Source Protection Zone I), the greater the risk of contamination -requiring more mitigation to ensure the development does not affect water quality. The site we promote [39/W10], like all of the other sites identified in the consultation document as 'potential' employment or mixed-use allocations, falls within Source Protection Zone 3. However, neither the residential nor employment elements are considered to comprise polluting activities. Moreover, there are no sites which are more preferably located -i.e. outside of the Source Protection Zone. The only site which appears to fall within Source Protection Zone 2 -i.e. closer to the extraction point -is the mixed-use site reference 28/W6. On this basis, the site (along with all the others identified) should be afforded an 'amber light' when assessed against Criterion 5, whilst recognising that the proposed uses would not be considered to be a polluting activity.
1660	31	<i>Criterion 6:</i> The site is identified in the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment within Landscape Character Policy Zone S PZ 37 - Hodsock Estate lands with Plantations'. The Landscape Character Assessment assesses the condition of the landscape in this area to be very poor with only moderate sensitivity. The overall assessment records the landscape character as 'create' -i.e. least sensitive and which may benefit from appropriately designed schemes that could introduce new or enhanced landscape character features. Accordingly, the site should be afforded a 'green light' when assessed against <i>Criterion 6</i> .

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1660	32	<i>Criterion 7:</i> It is considered that the development will have the potential to enhance the built character of the existing settlement or neighbourhood by introducing elements within the design and layout that are more reflective of the town's local vernacular than the existing residential development which presently defines the north eastern limit of the settlement. Opportunity will also be taken to link green infrastructure and footpaths through the creation of new open/amenity space, structural hedgerow and woodland planting which in themselves will assist in softening the appearance of the existing Distribution Centre which is acknowledged in the Council's landscape assessment as one of those detractive features in the landscape. The extension of the north eastern limits to the town along Blyth Road to incorporate this mixed-use site will represent a logical continuation of the general pattern of growth that has occurred in Worksop over the past 10 to 15 years (see page 6 of the enclosed Advocacy Document prepared by John R Paley Associates). Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed mixed-use development will enhance the existing built character of the settlement or neighbourhood and should therefore be afforded a 'green light ' when assessed against <i>Criterion 7</i> .
1660	33	<i>Criterion 8:</i> It is considered that there are opportunities to enhance the existing green infrastructure of this part of the settlement by providing logical and attractive linkages to the local footpath and bridleway network and creating attractive areas of open space which will have a functional and amenity use whilst delivering ecological and biodiversity benefits. In particular, as a key feature of the masterplan, a central green spine is proposed through the site to link the existing bridleway located to the east of Blyth Road (opposite the Thievesdale Lane/Blyth Road junction) with an area of public open space in the north western corner. The area of open space in the north western corner will be multi-functional comprising shared amenity/recreational space for future residents/workers as well as providing surface water storage as part of a wider SuDS solution. Additional public open space will also be provided to offer the future potential to link to an area of existing woodland to the west of the site. For the above reasons, it is considered that the proposed mixed-use development will build on and enhance the existing green infrastructure of this part of the settlement and should therefore be afforded a 'green light ' when assessed against <i>Criterion 8</i> .
1660	34	<i>Criterion 9:</i> No. All potential constraints identified during the SHLAA process have been satisfactorily addressed such that there are no outstanding issues which might otherwise prevent the delivery and/or early release of this site for development.
1660	35	Archaeology. The Council's 'final SHLAA' identifies a small area of archaeological interest to the west of the site and records that ' <i>further work is underway on this matter</i> '. Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd has therefore commissioned URS Scott Wilson to prepare a Geophysical Survey Specification (in liaison with Ursilla Spence (the County Archaeologist) to further understand the potential for archaeology to be encountered within the site. URS have advised that there is little archaeology within the site.
1660	36	Access. The SHLAA confirms that there is no highways objection in principle to the proposed mixed-use development subject to satisfactory details of layout, access, parking and servicing. URS Scott Wilson has been commissioned by Taylor Wimpey to progress the strategy for the access further in liaison with Justin Ward, Principal Development Control Officer, Nottinghamshire County Council Highways. The report concludes that the proposed mixed use development can be adequately served via the provision of 2 new standard priority T-junctions from Thievesdale Lane and Blyth Road. Junction Capacity Analysis has revealed that all 3 junctions (the existing Thievesdale Lane/Blyth Road junction and the 2 new junctions into the site as proposed) operate within capacity when development traffic is added. I also enclose a copy of a letter from Justin Ward dated 17 November 2011 confirming that the principles of the access arrangements set out in the Access Strategy Report are acceptable.
1660	37	Protected Species. Whilst not identified in the SHLAA, the 2 ponds evident on and close to the site have been appraised to assess the likelihood of the presence of Great Crested Newts. The appraisal confirms that both ponds are very unlikely to support Great Crested Newts and that there are no further amphibian surveys are considered necessary to inform a planning application at this time. The site has no outstanding constraints and should therefore be afforded a 'green light' when assessed against <i>Criterion 9</i> .
1661	1	Blyth: 589 – It is possible to provide access from Retford Road itself for a limited development of up to 6 or 7 dwellings, potentially this may be from either a shared private drive or a fully adoptable roadway provided that it can be demonstrated sufficient visibility can be achieved at the site access given the close proximity of the two different speed limits in force either side of the bridge structure, close to the potential access points.
1661	2	Blyth: 590 - It is possible to provide access from Retford Road itself for a limited development of up to 6 or 7 dwellings, potentially this may be from either a shared private drive or a fully adoptable roadway provided that it can be demonstrated sufficient visibility can be achieved at the site access given the close proximity of the two different speed limits in force either side of the bridge structure, close to the potential access points.
1661	3	Carlton in Lindrick: 385 - In principle this site could be accessed via site 219 and Chestnut Road. However it will be subject to a restriction on the number of houses served off a single access in accordance with the County Council design guidance. A Transport Assessment will be required.
1661	4	Harworth and Bircotes: 358 - In principle this site could be accessed via site 205 , but would be restricted by the requirements of Notts CC design guidance.
1661	5	Harworth and Bircotes: 359 - In principle this site could be accessed via site 205 , but would be restricted by the requirements of Notts CC design guidance.
1661	6	Harworth and Bircotes: H4 - Access to the A614 will need to be assessed and improvements made as necessary. Also the A614/Blyth Road and A614/A1 junctions. A Transport Assessment and Travel Plan will be required.
1661	7	Harworth and Bircotes: H6 - The 614/Blyth Road and A614/A1 junctions will need assessing and improvements made as necessary. The Highways Agency will need consulting. A Transport Assessment and Travel Plan will be required.
1661	8	Mattersey: 588 - It would appear that this site is currently a large range of redundant traditional agricultural buildings with an existing access onto Main Street. Main Street is subject to a 30mph speed limit. A wide footway crosses the site frontage. There is scope for residential development on this site, subject to appropriate detailing (access width, visibility splays, turning heads etc.).

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1661	9	Misson: 383 - No objection on highway grounds subject to it being demonstrated any new access could provide sufficient visibility splays when considering the narrow footway width and presence of a hedgerow.
1661	10	N Leverton: 586 - No objection in principle subject to adequate access design in accordance with Notts CC standards. A footway should be constructed across this site frontage as part of any future development proposals in order to provide a safe place for pedestrians to wait before crossing the road.
1661	11	N & S Wheatley: 236 - Top Pasture Lane is adopted in part. The adopted section of road can accommodate 2-way traffic flows, has street lighting and has a footway on the south side of the lane. Beyond the adopted section the lane is unsuitable to serve additional residential development unless significant highway improvements occur to bring it up to an adoptable standard. It would appear that this site is accessed from the adopted section of Top Pasture Lane. On this basis, there is scope for residential development on this site, subject to the development conforming to this Authority's Highway Design Guide in terms of layout, visibility splays etc.
1661	12	Retford: 336 - No objections in principle, but subject to adequate access off Bolham Lane being provided at design stage to Notts CC requirements.
1661	13	Retford: 342 - No objections in principle, but subject to adequate access being provided at design stage to Notts CC requirements.
1661	14	Retford: 364 - There is no obvious suitable access to this site without removing existing houses. Notwithstanding this, if access could be achieved, a loop road arrangement would be sought with access through to West Hill Road made at two points. Off site highway works would be required subject to the agreed findings of a transport assessment. This site is not so well linked with the town centre facilities as other option sites to the north and east of the town. A Travel Plan will be required.
1661	15	Worksop: 23 - There appears to be an existing factory building on the site. The existing vehicular access to the rear of the property via Boundary Row is substandard, and is not appropriate to accommodate an increase in vehicle movements. Considering the existing/previous use of the site, limited residential development is likely to be acceptable.
1661	16	Worksop: 151 - The Highway Authority has concerns with regard to residential development in this location. The site is in a location where the A57 would cause severance from Worksop, affecting the sites sustainability and having the potential to lead to pedestrian and cyclist safety issues due to the need to cross the road. Furthermore, there is no safe pedestrian route to access the local amenities of the Shireoaks area. These issues would need to be addressed if the site were to be developed for housing. No direct access to the A57 will be permitted.
1661	17	Worksop: 371 - The Highway Authority has concerns with regard to residential development in this location. The site is in a location where the A57 would cause severance from Worksop, affecting the site's sustainability and having the potential to lead to pedestrian and cyclist safety issues due to the need to cross the road. These issues would need to be addressed if the site were to be developed for housing.
1661	18	Walkeringham: 286 - There is a narrow footway to the north of the site which is substandard and provides little protection to pedestrians. Unless this could be improved then this site does not link well with the village centre. Improvements would probably require a narrowing down of the carriageway, which would require further detailed assessment. Such narrowing may not be possible/desirable.
1661	19	Walkeringham: 353 - There may be problems in achieving adequate and safe access visibility splays. This would need to be assessed once speed readings are taken to determine what splay distances are appropriate. Also there is a narrow footway to the north of the site which is substandard and provides little protection to pedestrians. Unless this could be improved then this site does not link well with the village centre (see site 286 above). Therefore the delivery of housing on this site may be difficult to achieve.
1661	20	Walkeringham: 366 - No objections in principle but footway provision would be required along the site frontage and possible improvements made to the existing footway to the north of the site
1662	1	Yes - but it was felt that some areas were better publicized.
1662	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop; Retford and Harworth Bircotes?
1662	3	Circumstances have changed in the village since the previous consultation and taking into consideration the recent loss of the village post office and the possible loss of the village pub which is currently up for auction; the Parish Council disagree with the above question. Members are also questioning whether Elkesley can still be classed as a Rural Service Centre.
1662	4	No, the Parish Council's view would not change, a development of 33 houses on this site is too many.
1662	5	The Council would also like to have the Ridge and Furrow area of the field protected from any development.
1662	6	If the village had to have further development then the Parish Council would like to see part of the Yew Tree site (247) developed.
1662	7	The Parish Council agree with the comments already submitted in the previous consultation and would add the following issues: The existing sewage mains has insufficient capacity to cope with the existing demands.
1662	8	There are already a number of houses currently for sale in the village which have been for sale for some considerable time. The pending planning application for a biomass incinerator in the village has been putting prospective buyers off moving into the village.
1662	9	The village has now lost the post office and possibly the public house.
1662	10	The Parish Council would like all the identified open spaces to be protected from any future development proposals.
1662	11	We would also like any heritage asset sites protecting, and if possible the Robin Hood Way and Crookford Waters.
1662	12	Any new sites should be around existing sites.
1662	13	Separately due to the fact they are different communities.
1663	1	If sites 24 and 44 are to be developed there will need to upgrade the road.
1663	2	Possibly address the flood issue with engineering works which this site could assist.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1663	3	It would seem logical to look at the wider picture at least in Planning Principal.
1664	1	Whilst all criteria in the screening methodology set out in paragraphs 2.22-2.43 of the Site Allocations DPD are relevant considerations in the assessment of sites for residential development, a number of other important considerations are omitted.
1664	2	The screening criteria pay little regard to the location of a site relative to existing services and facilities and the need to build sustainable communities. PPS3 is clear that Local Development Documents in setting out their strategy for the planned location of new housing development should take into account the contribution to be made to cutting carbon emissions from focusing new development in locations with good public transport accessibility and/or by means other than the private car. The proximity to existing local community facilities, infrastructure and services is a further factor.
1664	3	A further matter which the screening criteria fail to address relates to highways and in particular whether a site can be accessed in a safe manner, without harm to the operation of the local highway network. Again this is an important consideration which should be taken into account when assessing the suitability of a site for residential development. It is therefore considered that additional screening criteria should be introduced to incorporate these points.
1664	4	Policy CS4 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy states that Harworth and Bircotes will meet <u>at least</u> 22% of the District's housing requirements during the plan period 2010-2028. This equates to <u>up to</u> 1560 dwellings. Harworth is identified by Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy as being the District's 'Main Regeneration Settlement' and is also identified to accommodate 35% of the District's future housing land requirements during the plan period. In light of this position, it is Persimmon Homes' view that the identified housing figure for the settlement should be considered as a minimum figure and where possible the District Council should seek to achieve greater numbers in order create a truly sustainable community, whereby the employees of the jobs created through the employment allocations have the opportunity to live in quality accommodation close to their place of work. Where a sustainable and deliverable site for housing comes forward which accords with the screening criteria set out in the Site Allocations DPD and would help deliver regeneration, it should be considered favourably, even if it would result in excess of 1,560 dwellings being delivered during the plan period.
1664	5	Persimmon Homes (Yorkshire) is promoting 8 hectares of land at Bawtry Road, Harworth as an allocation for residential development. This forms part of site BAS0194 as identified in the Site Allocations DPD Consultation. A separate, detailed submission has been prepared to support the promotion of this site and forms part of these representations. This accompanying document demonstrates that the site is immediately available and could accommodate up to 190 new dwellings.
1664	6	It has already been identified by the 2011 Bassetlaw SHLAA as being both suitable and achievable for residential development. Persimmon's experience in developing and marketing the adjoining site between 2006 and 2008 also indicates that there is market demand for further housing in this area and therefore the site is fully deliverable in the short term.
1664	7	This accompanying assessment has demonstrated that there are no technical constraints to the development of the site. It can also be considered favourably against all the Council's site assessment criteria as set out in the Site Allocations DPD Consultation, as well as other material planning considerations.
1664	8	The site can safely accommodate vehicular access without harm to the local highway network and given its proximity to public transport and local services and amenities, it offers the opportunity to create a sustainable residential extension to meet part of the future housing needs of Harworth.
1664	9	Finally, the development of the site would also generate considerable financial benefits to the local community, which is a further important material consideration. This includes jobs created through an approximate £18m construction of the site, up to £750,000 of new expenditure per annum in the local economy generated by the residents of the development, as well as over £1.5m in New Homes Bonus and over £300,000 per year in increased Council Tax receipts.
1664	10	It is noted much of the land identified for employment led mixed use development relates to the former Colliery site. It is acknowledged that this represents an important site within Hayworth and Bircotes and has the potential to deliver considerable regeneration benefits for the area. The delivery of the site in the short term has to be questioned in the current economic climate. In these circumstances it should not be used to prevent other sites coming forward in the short term such as land to the north of Bawtry Road (BAS0194) which is immediately deliverable and would also bring with it important regeneration benefits.
1664	11	At this stage Persimmon Homes has not carried out a formal public consultation of their proposals for the site, however prior to any planning application they would carry out a thorough and detailed exercise with neighbouring residents and key local stakeholders. This would ensure that local opinion and knowledge was taken into account, where possible in formulating the proposals. 3.3 Whilst at this stage it is not possible to demonstrate clear support for Persimmon's proposals, it should be noted that there was very limited local opposition to the adjoining Buckingham Court scheme application in 2006 and the subsequent take up of these houses has demonstrated a clear demand for quality family housing in this part of Harworth.
1664	12	Although outside of the presently defined development limits of Harworth and Bircotes, the site is not allocated for any alternative use in the saved policies of adopted Bassetlaw Local Plan, nor are there any other proposed allocations for the site in the emerging LDF, beyond its consideration as a potential residential allocation. Policy CS4 of the recently adopted LDF Core Strategy does however identify that at least 22% (1560 houses) of the district's housing requirement between 2010-2028 will be delivered in Harworth and Bircotes. The policy goes on to acknowledge that part of this requirement will be met by sustainable urban extensions.
1664	13	The proposed development of this site is also entirely compatible with surrounding land uses. The site forms a natural extension of the existing housing development to the south and west of the site and can effectively be considered to be an extension of the Buckingham Court housing development completed in 2008. Furthermore, there are no other existing or proposed land uses surrounding the site which would make it unsuitable for residential development.
1664	14	It is not proposed at this stage that the development of the site would include an element of employment or economic development use, as it is not considered to be an appropriate location for such uses, given the neighbouring residential properties. It is considered that future employment sites should be directed to the south of the built up area in accordance with the findings of the Employment Land Review, Policy CS4.B of the adopted Core Strategy and the proposed allocations set out in the draft Site Allocations DPD.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1664	15	Whilst not delivering site specific economic development, it would nonetheless help deliver economic growth to Harworth and the surrounding area, in line with its status in the adopted Core Strategy as the District's identified regeneration settlement.
1664	16	Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by the Localism Act) confirms that financial benefits arising from development are a material consideration. In this case the proposed housing development has an estimated total construction cost of around £18 million and this level of direct private investment could generate around 124 person-years of construction work, equal to around 12 Full Time Equivalent [FTE] construction jobs a year, or 25 annual temporary construction jobs based on the assumption that it will take 5 years to develop the site
1664	17	Once the housing is occupied, a number of indirect jobs will be supported in and around Harworth as a result of the increased expenditure patterns resulting from the new residents. It is estimated that the new residents could bring in approximately £750,000 per annum to the local economy, which could support around 5 jobs in the retail, leisure and service sectors. This would help support existing local businesses and retailers.
1664	18	Bassetlaw could also benefit from the New Homes Bonus Scheme, which for a housing development of this size, could generate up to £1.3 million, to be spent at the Council's discretion, and a further £350,000 to be spent at the County Council's discretion. Once occupied the development would also generate in the region of £320,000 annually in Council Tax receipts for Bassetlaw District Council.
1664	19	In addition to the financial and employment benefits, the development would deliver high quality family housing of a type and in a location which could attract future residents and employees of local businesses who may otherwise not choose to live in Harworth's existing housing stock.
1664	20	As identified in the accompanying Initial Landscape Appraisal contained at Appendix 3 , the soils on the site are relatively sandy, classified as Grade 3 agricultural land under the Agricultural Land Classification Scheme, albeit no distinction is made as to whether the soils are Grade 3a or 3b. It should be noted that there is no lesser quality agricultural land available for development in Harworth.
1664	21	The proposal site along with the whole of Harworth and Bircotes and a wide ranging area beyond falls within Source Protection Zone 3 (Zone 3 being the least sensitive of the 3 zones). An identified Zone 3 area is not considered by the Environment Agency to be an impediment to residential development which is generally a low polluting land use.
1664	22	An assessment of landscape character is contained at Appendix 3 . This demonstrates that the site lies within Forest Sandlands of the Idle Valley Lowlands Character Area. This is a rolling rural, largely agricultural landscape formed on a low glacial plateau. It is a mixed landscape of open fields with long distance views of a flat skyline where blocks of fairly regular edged deciduous and conifer woodland are a dominant feature of the skyline. The headgear of the colliery is also noted as a dominant feature on the skyline. The assessment goes on to conclude that due to its location next to the road and its size and shape in proximity to housing, the character of the site is mainly defined by its land use and setting on the edge of the built up area of Harworth, rather than an integral part of the overall rural landscape. In this regard, it is concluded that the development would not harm the local landscape character.
1664	23	Importantly, the proposal site is located within a 'Create' policy area as defined by the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment. This is identified as the least sensitive area in landscape terms, with the assessment acknowledging that in such locations, there is the potential for appropriately designed schemes to introduce new, or enhanced landscape features.
1664	24	As discussed within the assessment against Criterion 2, the site forms a natural extension both northwards and eastwards of the existing settlement boundary, and would relate well to the existing residential built form to the south and west, particularly the adjoining Buckingham Court development. The A631 would provide a natural and defensible future boundary of the settlement limit, providing the interface between the built up area and the more rural landscape beyond. 3.18 The accompanying Landscape Impact Assessment, discussed under Criterion 8 below, sets out how the site offers the opportunity to provide visual and bio-diversity enhancements to the boundary of the site, helping the integration between the built form and the rural and agricultural landscape.
1664	25	There are no landscape designations on the site. Whilst Swinnow Wood is located to the north east of the site off the A631, and is identified as 'replanted ancient woodland' within the National Inventory of Woodland and Trees, this would not be adversely affected. 3.20 As the accompanying Landscape Impact Assessment demonstrates, the proposed residential development of the site offers clear opportunities to improve green infrastructure within this part of Harworth, as well as access to it. The opportunity to provide new hedgerows and buffer planting set back against a potentially widened grass verge and footpath along the A631 would improve visual amenity and contribute to the wider bio-diversity of the area. It is considered that an increased belt of planting along the A631 would, in conjunction with existing planting create an improved wildlife corridor, linking Swinnow Wood to the areas to the west of the site. 3.21 The Landscape Impact Assessment also concludes that that the location and juxtaposition of the site in relation to surrounding land uses, means that the loss of this site an open area will be less significant than were the site in the middle of an open landscape.
1664	26	The 2011 Bassetlaw Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) concludes that there are no significant constraints to the successful delivery of this site for housing.
1664	27	Whilst the site (amongst others in the area) was identified as having potential for archaeological remains, this is not considered to be a significant constraint. An initial archaeological assessment has been carried out on the site and this is attached at Appendix 4 . This concludes that there is no evidence of nationally important archaeological remains on the site or within 500m that would prevent its allocation for housing development.
1664	28	It is noted that the 2011 SHLAA also raised queries about the market demand for new housing development in Harworth and Bircotes, thereby questioning the deliverability of this site (again amongst others) in the short term. Such a view is however wholly contrary to Persimmon's own experience in marketing the Buckingham Court development, when the houses were sold at the height of the 'credit crunch' in 2008. As a letter from Persimmon's Sales Manager, (Appendix 5) explains, their experience of selling properties on the adjacent site is such that there was and still is demand for additional new build in this location, particularly for 3 and 4 bedroom properties.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1664	29	Subject to a detailed ground investigation, all assessments carried out by Persimmon Homes to date indicate that there would be no barrier to the viable delivery of the scheme incorporating appropriate levels of affordable housing, as well as making a contribution to help alleviate the known deficiency in school place provision in the area, and any other directly related and required contributions.
1664	30	The suitability of the site in terms of providing safe vehicular access, as well as the capacity of the local road network to accommodate the additional traffic generated by up to 190 new houses, has been considered by Persimmon's traffic engineers. This has included discussions with Nottinghamshire County Council Highways Department. This assessment is contained at Appendix 6 and demonstrates that a safe access into the site, taking account of all necessary junction design requirements could be achieved off Bawtry Road, with the potential for a secondary access for pedestrians, cyclists and emergency services through Buckingham Court. This highway solution is considered to be a significant advantage for this site as it avoids the need to provide access into the site directly from the A631, or indeed the need to route the primary access for traffic through an existing residential estate road. Such a solution can not be easily achieved by a number of other green field sites in Harworth being considered for residential development.
1664	31	This assessment also demonstrates that the additional traffic generated would not have a detrimental affect upon the free flow of traffic on the local highway network, even at peak times.
1664	32	PPS3 is clear that Local Development Documents in setting out their strategy for the planned location of new housing development should take into account the contribution to be made to cutting carbon emissions from focusing new development in locations with good public transport accessibility and/or by means other than the private car. The proximity to existing local community facilities, infrastructure and services is a further factor. PPG13 also emphasises that walking is the most important mode of travel at the local level and offers the greatest potential to replace short car trips, particularly under two kilometres.
1664	33	In this case and as the Sustainability Plan at Appendix 1 demonstrates, the site benefits from excellent public transport links, as well as being located within close walking distance of a range of services and amenities.
1664	34	In terms of public transport provision, bus stops are located immediately adjacent to the site, along the eastern side of Bawtry Road, whilst further stops are located approximately 400m to the south on East Street. Bus services from these stops provide regular access to Blyth, Bawtry, Worksop and Doncaster, as well as to Robin Hood Airport, thereby providing access to the employment, services and employment opportunities provided by these centres, as well as opportunities for onward travel to more distant locations
1664	35	With regard to access to local services and amenities, the Sustainability Plan demonstrates that within a 500m radius of the site are recreational facilities, as well as a range of services located on Bawtry Road, including a hot food takeaway and a public house. Within 1km of the site are a variety of schools (both primary and secondary), a leisure centre, further recreation grounds, employment opportunities at Plumtree Park Industrial Estate, as well as the main local shopping and service centre on Scrooby Road, containing a supermarket, health centre, library and a variety of shops and services including banks, a pharmacy, hairdressers and further takeaways. All of these facilities are well within an accepted walking distance of the site and therefore it can be safely concluded that the site fully accords with both PPS3 and PPG13 in terms of its proximity to local services, public transport and the potential for the site to integrate as part of a wider mixed and sustainable community. 3.32 The clear sustainability benefits of the site fully accords with the emerging central government planning policy in the form of the National Planning Policy Framework, which goes as far as saying that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development.
1665	1	I wish to object strongly to the development of any additional houses at site 35 for the following reasons: A) Extension of town boundary and urban sprawl. The current Gateford Estate already extends to the existing town boundary. Development on site 35 will, therefore extend beyond the boundary and there is a concern that Worksop will eventually consume Wallingwells and continue to extend all the way to Carlton in Lindrick.
1665	2	B) Loss of amenity for children, residents and visitors. The proposed site is bordered by Owday Wood/Rough Piece and Owday Plantation, which are sites of importance for nature conservation. The woodland is at present untouched by housing. Development on site 35 will cause significant disturbance to these valuable woodlands.
1665	3	The public footpath/bridleway entering the area from Monford Road and stretching to Owday plantation is bordered by beautiful tree and hedgerows, which are important for local wildlife and for our environment. The bridleway and footpaths are used daily by many walkers, both from the estate and also by visiting recreational users.
1665	4	Development on this would result in a loss of amenity for local residents and would be detrimental to the entire area. In addition, increased traffic levels on the estate would reduce the quality of our environment by increasing noise levels, pollution and danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
1665	5	C) Loss of agricultural land. Agricultural land provides employment. Site 35 is productive agricultural land. It is currently being farmed, producing crops including wheat and Oilseed rape
1665	6	D) Access to shopping facilities our local shops which are sites off the estate are already busy with traffic and virtually gridlocked at busy times, which is a measure of their success. However, the main shops, including the proposed new Asda and Tesco supermarkets, are sites closer to the town centre, and are impractical for access on foot from site 35. This will lead to increased traffic levels to and from the town.
1665	7	E) Access to healthcare provision. Access to healthcare provision is limited, with doctors and dentists being sites on the other side of town. Access on foot from site 35 is impractical. In my recent experience access to doctors and dentists when required are currently at full capacity. with the increased population of Worksop you cannot see a doctor under 3 weeks unless it is an emergency.
1665	8	F) Provision of utilities and services. Development on site 35 will require significant investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of the new housing development, as current provision is at, or near capacity due to the remote location of the site. Improvements would be needed to upgrade level of service provision due to increased demand.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1666	1	The same housing policy goal is echoed within the draft National Planning Policy Framework I (NPPF) (July 2011) at paragraph 107. It is acknowledged that it would not be realistic to envisage a scale of village expansion that in effect alters the character of the settlement. However, it is considered that within Cuckney there are a number of sites capable of coming forward for development without altering the existing character of the settlement. Welbeck - welcomes the opportunity for an allocation of at least 11 new houses.
1666	2	Welbeck controls the three potential housing allocations identified on the Cuckney Proposal Map (page78) and has participated in the early stages of plan preparation with a view to promoting residential development on each site, namely sites 303, 398 and 399. Welbeck welcomes the identification of these sites as future housing allocations. The deliverability of the sites is considered below.
1666	3	Site Ref. 303 (Land South of Creswell Road) - The site is readily available for redevelopment. The site comprises former allotment gardens, bounded to the south west by a laid out recreation ground. The site serves no meaningful purpose for agriculture and the site is well situated within the built-up framework of Cuckney representing a suitable 'infill' development opportunity. The site is capable of providing direct frontage access in accordance with Manual for Streets 2. This parcel of land extends to 0.249 hectares (ha) as shown on Plan CU167.I-dev-plan-2008 and could deliver 8 dwellings at a density of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph). There are no site constraints that would preclude the submission of a planning application and the delivery of the site within five years.
1666	4	Site Ref. 398 (Land off Norton Lane) -The site is readily available for development. The site comprises partly vacant land and arable farm land. The Agricultural Land Classification information data provided by MAGIC confirms that that development of this site would not result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (i.e. grades 1, 2 and/or 3a).
1666	5	The site is currently served by an existing access off Norton Lane and there is considered to be no physical constraints preventing the site from coming forward.
1666	6	The site is well related to the existing built character of the settlement. Having regard to the Bassetlaw District Council Landscape Character Assessment, it is considered that the site is well contained and would not impact negatively on the existing landscape character. This parcel of land extends to 0.62 ha as shown on Plan PFI8500.01 and could deliver 19 dwellings at a density of 30 dph. There are no site constraints that would preclude the submission of a planning application and the delivery of the site within five years.
1666	7	Site Ref. 399 (Land North of Budby Road (A616)) - The site is readily available for development. The site comprises arable farm land. The Agricultural Land Classification information data provided by MAGIC confirms that that development of this site would not result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (i.e. grades 1, 2 and/or 3a).
1666	8	Having regard to the Bassetlaw District Council Landscape Character that the site is well contained and would not impact, negatively on the existing landscape character. This parcel of land extends to 1.2 ha as shown on Plan PF/8500.02 and could deliver 36 dwellings at a density of 30 dph. There are no site constraints that would preclude the submission of a planning application and the delivery of the site within five years.
1666	9	It is acknowledged that it would not be realistic to envisage a scale of village expansion that in effect alters the character of the settlement. However, it is considered that within Nether Langwith there are a number of sites capable of coming forward for development without altering the existing character of the settlement. Welbeck welcomes the opportunity for an allocation of at least 10 new houses.
1666	10	Welbeck controls two of the potential housing allocation identified by the Nether Langwith Proposals Map (Page 109), namely sites 256 and 252. Welbeck has participated in the earlier stages of plan preparation with a view to promoting these sites for residential development. Welbeck welcomes the identification of these sites as future housing allocations. The deliverability of the sites is considered below.
1666	11	Site Ref. 256 (Land South of French Terrance, Nether Langwith) - The site is readily 3 available for development. Land South of French Terrance is surrounded by existing residential development and as such represents a suitable infill development opportunity. Having regard to the Bassetlaw District Council Landscape Character Assessment development on this site would not serve to impact negatively on the existing landscape. This parcel of land extends to 1.35 ha as shown on Plan n1167.2-dev-plan-2008 and could deliver 40 dwellings at a density of 30 dph. There are no site constraints that would preclude the submission of a planning application and the delivery of the site within five years.
1666	12	Site Ref. 252 (Land South of Main Road, Nether Langwith) - The site is readily available for development. The site is located on the south side of the settlement and is contained by defensible field boundaries. It is considered that this site is well related to the existing built form of the existing settlement and that development of the site would not serve to impact adversely on the existing landscape character. This parcel of land extends to 0.338 ha as shown on Plan nl167.I-dev-plan-2008 and could deliver 10 dwellings at a density of 30 dph. There are no site constraints that would preclude the submission of a planning application and the delivery of the site within five years.
1666	13	Welbeck acknowledges that the adopted Core Strategy establishes the level and distribution for new development for the identified Plan Period and that this is no longer the subject of further consultation. However, it is considered that within the draft consultation document little weight or consideration has been given to the proposed redevelopment of the Welbeck Colliery site at Meden Vale for employment generating purposes. The Council will be aware that in November 2010 a public consultation, event organised by Framptons on behalf of 'Meden Vale - the Future', was carried out. The public consultation, in the form of two public exhibitions, sought to gather local opinions on the future of Welbeck Colliery. 'Meden Vale - the Future' is a charity which was registered in July 2006. Their prime objective is to co-ordinate and assist consideration in the future of the Colliery with landowners, public bodies and the local community following the closure of the mine. The public consultation demonstrated there to be an overwhelming majority of the local community (some 81%) who expressed a preference for the site to be redeveloped for some form of employment generation with a view to jobs being created to replace those lost over time following the closure of the Colliery. A number of meetings have taken place between Officers of Bassetlaw and Mansfield District Councils, the County as Minerals Authority, the site operator UK Coal and the site owner Welbeck to consider future options for the site. In addition, Welbeck has received a number of enquiries concerning the possibility of energy recovery uses on the site.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1666	14	On the 7" June 2011 officers at Bassetlaw District Council presented to the Cabinet Committee a report titled 'Welbeck Colliery Regeneration'. The purpose of which was to seek approval for officers to discuss potential redevelopment options relating to the site ... The Cabinet Committee resolved that: The principle of the redevelopment of the Welbeck Colliery site for employment purposes should be supported. Officers be authorised to discuss the potential redevelopment options relating to the site of the former Welbeck Colliery and adjacent land with all interested parties. The aim of these discussions should be to seek a solution that secures the maximum economic, social and amenity benefit. The outcome of the discussions should be reported back to a future Cabinet Meeting.
1666	15	Welbeck considers that it would be appropriate for paragraph 2.10 of the consultation draft Issues and Options document to include reference to these considerations. Presently the Issues and Options document simply states: <i>'The Council will, clearly, support suitable applications for economic development in other areas over the plan period.'</i>
1666	16	It is considered that Welbeck Colliery warrants an allocation within the emerging Site Allocations development plan document (DPD). The format of the consultation draft is such that a new section numbered 10.22 and titled 'Welbeck Colliery' could easily be added to contain a site specific redevelopment policy, a justification, and a site location plan.
1666	17	Welbeck welcomes the opportunity for further discussions to take place between themselves, their agents and both Bassetlaw and Mansfield District Council on the allocation of Welbeck Colliery as a potential source of new employment opportunities ... Given the level of support expressed by both Bassetlaw and Mansfield District Council for the redevelopment of Welbeck Colliery, it is submitted that Welbeck Colliery should to be identified within the emerging Site Allocation DPD as a site for employment. The allocation of Welbeck Colliery would therefore provide the policy basis to facilitate inward investment opportunity for employment uses and reinforce the Council's commitment of support.
1667	1	Natural England are not in a position to comment on the level of growth for each settlement or the development of specific sites however we would like the following advice to be taken into account.
1667	2	Sustainable communities: Natural England recognise that significant levels of development will put increased pressure on the natural environment however we also realise the potential opportunity the growth provides to invest in the environment and deliver substantial benefits for people, places and nature. Natural England believe if new development is carefully planned, designed, developed and managed it will be possible to meet the environmental, social and economic needs of our present and future communities.
1667	3	It is vital that the right of kind of development is delivered in the right place. Options should be pursued that primarily protect but also seek to enhance and improve the current environmental assets as a cultural and recreational amenity and as a resource for biodiversity.
1667	4	Natural England also believes a key consideration to achieve truly sustainable development should be the location of development in relation to current transport infrastructure. We consider it imperative to incorporate infrastructure into the design that encourages the use of more sustainable modes of transport. In order to encourage modal shift to more sustainable options there should be ease of access to an efficient and effective, integrated public transport system and a network of improved attractive pedestrian and cycle routes should be incorporated into the design linking this site to the surrounding area. Development proposals should try to deliver cycle routes and a separate access for cyclists and pedestrians encouraging residents to travel by a sustainable mode. It is recommended that the Rights of Way Improvement Plan prepared by Nottinghamshire County Council is consulted at an early stage to add the greatest value.
1667	5	We note the Council is currently assessing the value and quality of open spaces in the District. A crucial step will be to gather a robust evidence base to inform the DPD. We therefore recommend a GI mapping exercise is carried out to identify all existing green spaces and corridors to produce a plan for multi-functional green infrastructure (GI) as part of the growth. The GI mapping exercise should identify all public and private assets, with and without public access in both urban and rural locations.
1667	6	We recommend that where existing areas of open space are identified as being of poor quality that consideration is given to measures that could be implemented to improve the value of the site and the role of the green space to the overall strategic GI network before the land is allocated for development.
1667	7	This GI plan is necessary in order to inform the design of development to the highest possible standards, and to provide multi-functional green space, including green transport opportunities, landscape and biodiversity benefits and opportunities for people to interact with and utilise green space. The GI framework should aim to protect the green space network minimise any potentially detrimental environmental effects and maximising opportunities for gain. However we acknowledge there may be exceptions and where open space is lost we consider there should be enhancements provided as part of the development to ensure that there is no net loss of biodiversity in accordance with the principles of PPS9.
1667	8	Applications for development should include a plan for the design, delivery and maintenance of GI, to recognised Access to Natural Green Space Targets (ANGST). Efforts should be made to form links with the wider countryside or existing areas of open space to create an enhanced network of greenspace
1667	9	Consideration of the likely impacts from this development on breeding nightjar and woodlark within the Sherwood Forest area: Natural England has issued a revised Advice Note for those Local Planning Authorities in and around the Sherwood Forest area dealing with plans and applications with potential to affect land which may or may not in the future become a potential Special Protection Area (pSPA). The advice has been updated in view of the decision by the Secretary of State to refuse the Rufford Energy Recovery Facility application, following a Public Inquiry.
1667	10	It remains our view that there is currently no pSPA in Sherwood and therefore the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and statutory policy governing pSPAs does not apply. However there is the possibility that it might occur in the future and this is presently been considered as part of a UK wide Review of the SPA Series being led by Government. We recognise that the consequences of a possible future classification of an SPA in the Sherwood area places a difficulty on Local Planning Authorities with regard to how they should consider land allocations and policies in forward plans and individual applications for planning consent. How local authorities choose to confront this issue is a matter for them, however Natural England would advocate a 'risk based approach' or similar be adopted to provide a degree of future-proofing for decision-taking until such a time that it is clear whether or not the statutory policies concerning potential SPAs apply to an area of Sherwood Forest. The Secretary of State endorsed Natural England's 'risk based approach'.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1667	11	A copy of the revised Advice Note is enclosed for your consideration. Natural England suggest that as part of a risk-based approach to forward planning and decision-making, development plans and proposals are accompanied by an additional and robust assessment of the likely impacts arising from the proposals on breeding nightjar and woodlark in the Sherwood Forest area. Therefore we would encourage the Authority to ensure the information provided is sufficient for you to assess the likelihood of potential impacts arising from development on the breeding nightjar and woodlark population and has addressed the potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts which may include, but may not be limited to, the following: Disturbance to breeding birds from people, their pets, noise, traffic and/or artificial; lighting; loss, fragmentation and/or damage to breeding and/or feeding habitat; bird mortality arising from domestic pets and/or predatory mammals and birds; bird mortality arising from road traffic and/or wind turbines; pollution and/or nutrient enrichment of breeding habitats.
1667	12	As part of a risk-based approach, we would also suggest your Authority consider the use of appropriate mitigation and/or avoidance measures to reduce the likelihood of significant impacts which might adversely affect breeding nightjar and woodlark populations occurring.
1668	1	Harworth Estates broadly support the screening methodology outlined within Section 2 of the document.
1668	2	The criteria includes an approach which includes a number of key areas being considered, including landscape, built form and community support. In general terms we do not object to the criteria set out however we do consider that an additional or amended criteria should be added which relates to “does the allocation of the site help to deliver the aims and objectives set out in the Core Strategy and in National Planning Policy”. Given that one of the fundamental tests of soundness in PPS12 relates to the compatibility of DPDs with national policy and overarching policy documents, it is felt that the assessment of the suitability of sites within this document should be considered on this basis in addition to the criteria set out.
1668	3	Furthermore, specific reference and consideration to the emerging Planning Policy context, at a national and (consequently) regional level should be taken into consideration. The Government anticipates that the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) will be formally published before the end of March 2012 (and likely sooner) which clearly will have implications as to the soundness of the Site Allocations DPD. Since the NPPF will superseded and replace all current PPS and PPG, this will form the basis of planning policy at a national level. Hence, in order for the DPD to be considered sound with respect to its consistency with national policy, the document should pay due regard to the likely content of the NPPF. In addition, should the final published version of the NPPF make specific alterations these will need to be taken into account on later consultation version of the DPD. Given the likely publication of this document, which is unlikely to involve any fundamental changes to the principles surrounding economic development, we consider that the Council should take due attention to this document as part of its considerations in drawing up its Preferred Options (and subsequent Submissions Version) for the Site Allocations DPD.
1668	4	In respect of Criteria 1, which relates to community support, Harworth Estates suggest that it needs to be clear how sites with ‘no comments’ from the community would be ranked. It is likely that ‘no comments’ would suggest no objections to the proposals. In respect of Harworth Estates site at Harworth Colliery (Reference BAS0190), we make the following comments in respect of Criteria 1, 2, 3 and 6:
1668	5	Criteria 1 – Consultation has previously been undertaken by Spawforths and Harworth Estates in respect of the redevelopment of the wider colliery site, which now has planning permission for redevelopment with housing, employment and retail development. Through the consultation with the community it was apparent that the community were largely supportive of the redevelopment of the colliery site, recognising the regeneration benefits the redevelopment of a key site such as this, with the scale of development proposed would bring to the settlement. There were also very few objections submitted to Bassetlaw District Council during the consideration of the planning application.
1668	6	Criteria 2 – The site (Reference BAS0190) is sustainably located, adjacent to the settlement of Harworth Bircotes and as such is within extremely close proximity of local services, facilities and future and existing employment opportunities. The wider colliery site, located to the north, south and east of site reference BAS0190 already has the benefit of planning permission for mixed use redevelopment (residential, employment and retail) for which site preparation is underway. It is therefore considered that the redevelopment of site reference BAS0190 with housing would be compatible with existing and/or proposed neighbouring land uses. Furthermore, it could accommodate suitable mitigation, if and where required, to mitigate against any necessary noise sources from the adjacent future employment use that already has the benefit of planning permission on the wider colliery site. Harworth Estates consider that the site (Reference BAS0190) presents a logical and sustainable approach to accommodating the growth of the settlement whilst also facilitating the regeneration of former colliery land adjacent to the centre of the only Main Regeneration Settlement in the District. Harworth Estates therefore strongly support the allocation of this site for housing.
1668	7	Criteria 3 – Whilst Criteria 3 is directed towards employment development and the site (Reference BAS0190) is identified for housing, it would provide indirect benefits for economic development opportunities for the settlement which in turn will help aid its regeneration. These include employment opportunities (temporary construction) and encouragement of inward investment to the settlement.
1668	8	Criteria 6 – The area is identified as very poor landscape condition and low sensitivity therefore having a low landscape character in the Landscape Character Assessment – Bassetlaw, Nottinghamshire, August 2009. Furthermore, given the site’s (Reference BAS0190) location within a built up area of Harworth Bircotes, close to industrial uses, a colliery site (with planning permission for mixed use redevelopment with housing and employment) and the centre of Harworth Bircotes, it is not considered that the development would have any significant impact on landscape character. It is however considered that other sites identified for housing, which are located on the periphery of the settlement will have a more significant and detrimental impact on landscape character and the setting of Harworth, given the rural nature and character of these sites and their relationship to the wider countryside.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1668	9	Harworth Bircotes is a mining town that is in need of regeneration. The settlement is identified as the only Main Regeneration Settlement in Bassetlaw's Core Strategy. Furthermore, the Core Strategy (Adopted December 2011) states that the housing identified for Harworth Bircotes are minimum requirements. However, in line with the Core Strategy, new development in Harworth is to contribute to a step change in the settlement, delivering an improved range and quality of housing, contribute to achieving a popular and busy town centre, and with strong connections with the existing town and surrounding communities. Redevelopment of the colliery site as already approved will kick start regeneration, but further development and growth is required to further encourage inward investment and regeneration to drive the step change in the nature of the settlement. It is however essential that this growth is in sustainable locations that also bring regeneration benefits to the settlement.
1668	10	Further development in the settlement needs to be sustainable and accord with local, regional and national planning policy and guidance and therefore needs to be located in the most sustainable locations. In particular, PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development) and PPS3 (Housing) state that housing and economic development need to be located in the most appropriate locations that are close to public transport routes and are in sustainable locations. Paragraph 36 of PPS3 states in support of its objective for creating mixed and sustainable communities, the government's policy is to ensure that housing is developed in suitable locations which offer a range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. Paragraph 69 of PPS3 sets out the criteria LPAs should have regard to in the determination of planning applications, which includes achieving high quality and a mix of housing; the suitability of a site for housing, including its environmental sustainability; effective and efficient use of land; and ensuring development is in line with housing objectives, reflecting the need and demand for housing.
1668	11	The most sustainable locations are those closest to the centre of Harworth, such as the colliery site (Reference BAS0190). The development of this site for housing would support the redevelopment and regeneration of the wider colliery site, the regeneration of the centre of Harworth as well as underpin existing services and facilities, whilst also encouraging new ones to Harworth. The site is also located close to existing and future employment opportunities in the town and public transport links. It has the ability to provide a mix of quality housing and make effective and efficient use of the former colliery site. It is therefore considered that site reference BAS0190 would provide an appropriate expansion of Harworth Bircotes and support the growth and regeneration of land to the south of the main street through Harworth Bircotes – Scrooby Road. Development of this site would also be in line with local, regional and national policy and guidance and local housing objectives. Harworth Estates strongly support the allocation of this site for housing.
1668	12	Some of the more peripheral sites around Harworth are considered less suitable to accommodate the growth of Harworth, given the incursion into the open countryside that would result from their development and their distance from the centre of the settlement, its services, facilities, employment opportunities and public transport links. These are considered to be less sustainable options for the growth of the settlement, compared to for example, the Harworth Colliery site (Reference BAS0190).
1668	13	Should the land to the south of Harworth Bircotes currently identified for employment, become a confirmed allocation for development, Harworth Estates do not think that a mix of uses, other than employment, would be of benefit to the settlement of Harworth Bircotes. This is due to the sites locations detached from the centre of Harworth and its services and facilities, which would lead to an unsustainable form of development and future growth of Harworth Bircotes. It is also not considered that a mix of development, other than employment, in this location would capture the regeneration benefits that Harworth Bircotes needs. Therefore it is considered that a mix of uses in such a location would undermine the regeneration of the settlement and would not be of benefit to the settlement.
1669	1	Prior to the deadline date of 31 Jan 2012 we have attached a revised indicative land use plan produced by Sanderson Associates. The only change is that the numbers on the housing densities have been changed to a white background to match the key.
1669	2	However, we would also like to stress that the Gateford area has delivered in the region of 3000 housing units over the last 20 years, equating to a delivery rate of circa 150 units per year. We consider that the area is the key future housing delivery area as it has been in recent times and gatefold should be identified as the 'principal delivery location' in Worksop and Bassetlaw. This takes in to account the level of future housing (circa a third) that is being directed to the town within the context of the District.
1670	1	It is considered that there should be some opportunity for new housing development within the settlement of Gamston, however given the character of the settlement and the lack of local facilities this should be limited. The 2011 Strategic Housing Land Availability Study identifies 4 sites that are developable for housing in years 6-10 of the plan period. Based on a density of 30 dwellings to the hectare, this could deliver 38 dwellings. It is considered that this level of housing in the settlement could not be accommodated without investment into additional infrastructure and services. Only one of the sites is within the settlement development limits, Site Ref 577 and this has a capacity to accommodate 7 dwellings. A site providing this capacity would seem to be sufficient land for future housing development in the settlement. Notwithstanding any allocations made through the Site Allocations DPD, there will be opportunities for windfall development within Gamston over the plan period on infill plots.
1670	2	The SHLAA assessment concludes that this site may be suitable for development but there are a number of constraints to development. The development of the site has potential heritage impacts in terms of the proximity of the site to two Listed Buildings, its location within a Conservation Area and the location of the site within an identified area of archaeological interest.
1670	3	The assessment also envisages that potentially there are highway constraints in terms of visibility onto the main A638. The speed limit along this stretch of road is 40mph and appropriate visibility splays would need to be achieved for the site to be suitable for residential development.
1670	4	Although the site is located in Flood Zone 1, it is greenfield and the Environment Agency would require that the current greenfield run-off is retained through the inclusion of a sustainable urban drainage scheme (SUDS) as part of any future development.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1670	5	Although the SHLAA assessment concludes that the site is within the wider residential area and as such is suitable for residential development, it is currently outside the settlement development limits. Although the Core Strategy does make provision for the boundary settlements to be changed in order to accommodate site allocations, it is also considered that the settlement boundaries should be sufficiently flexible in any event to ensure that small windfall sites are able to come forward over the plan period to supplement the housing requirement of the settlement.
1670	6	This site is adjacent to Site 412 and has the same constraints regarding its suitability for housing development. However, it is considered that given that it is considerably larger than the adjacent site, the overall impacts of developing this site would be significantly greater. The SHLAA assessment states that 21 dwellings could be achieved on this site at a density of 30 dwellings per hectare based on 90% of the gross area of the site. This is considered optimistic given the sites Conservation Area status and proximity to the identified Listed Buildings. Notwithstanding this, the development of this site would represent a significant increase in the number of houses within the settlement (18%) and it is considered that this could not be supported by the current level of services and community facilities within the settlement.
1670	7	This site is located to the west of St Peter's Church a Grade II Listed Building, and church yard. It also falls within the Conservation Area, although is currently outside the settlement envelope of the village. The SHLAA assessment concludes that the site may be suitable for housing but identifies a number of constraints that will restrict the amount of development achievable on the site. In particular the site would require significant improvements to the access arrangements in order to accommodate 5 dwellings on the site. The site is considered to offer some limited potential for residential development provided the identified constraints can be overcome.
1670	8	The main constraint to developing this site for housing development is the substandard access; however the Council in the SHLAA assessment of the site consider that this could be achieved by combining the existing access with an adjacent parallel route.
1670	9	Although the site is within a Conservation Area this is true of the whole settlement and as such any new housing development would be expected to achieve high standards of design. There is no objection in principle to this site being allocated for housing development; however it is considered that the number proposed for the site would represent a density not in keeping with the character of the area and 4 or 5 dwellings would be more appropriate for the site.
1670	10	Although the settlement development boundaries were consulted on as part of the Core Strategy, it is considered that these have been drawn so tightly as to preclude any opportunities for windfall development, particularly in those parts of Gamston that have previously been within the established settlement boundary. It is considered that Rectory Lane forms a natural boundary to the settlement and historically has been considered as such. The boundary proposed in the Core Strategy proposals maps is considered to be artificial and does not follow any natural features at ground level. Retention of Rectory Lane as the outer limit of the settlement would provide flexibility to the village envelope to allow for limited infill development where appropriate.
1670	11	It is of concern that my client was told by the Planning Officer at the village consultation event prior to Christmas that legally the Council had no option but to draw the settlement boundary as set out in the Core Strategy Proposals Maps as a result of the re-designation of garden land as greenfield land. This is clearly incorrect, since although Government Guidance encourages development on previously developed land ahead of greenfield sites, there is nothing in either legislation or government policy that proscribes development on greenfield sites. It is our opinion that the redrawing of the settlement boundary of Gamston by the Council is a policy decision by them to restrict development on garden land by removing it from the settlement envelope. The historic boundary of the settlement of Gamston, in our view, should remain and the Local Planning Authority should judge on individual merit any application proposal for development that comes before it utilising the Development Management Policies as adopted in the Core Strategy (2011).
1670	12	Gamston has Conservation Area status and as such due regard should be had to its character. It is evident that the settlement has evolved organically with development occurring on single plots over the course of the last two or three hundred years. The Core Strategy settlement boundary has been drawn so tightly around the settlement that in order to accommodate additional development in Gamston of the scale required, this will require the Council to identify allocations of less than 10, contrary to guidance on allocating housing sites. However, given the conservation status of the village this is considered to be a more appropriate response than identifying large scale development at the edge of the settlement.
1670	13	Our client is seeking the re-designation of part of his garden land that is proposed as protected open space as a housing allocation for one dwelling. The site has previously been granted planning permission in the past for residential development and as such is considered to be an appropriate site. Figure 1 below highlights the changes that our client would wish to see to the Proposals Maps with the area hatched in red representing that part of the proposed open space that should be allocated for housing development.
1670	14	The Council's PPG17 Open Space Study (March 2010) was undertaken by Knight, Kavanagh and Page and provides the evidence base for the Local Development Framework. Only one area of Open Space in Gamston is assessed by the Study, and this is the recreational ground located off the Great North Road which scores highly in terms of its overall quality and value. No assessment is made in this study of the other two areas of open space identified as Potential Protected Open Space in the Site Allocations Issues and Options Paper. Quality and value are defined in the Study as being fundamentally very different. A space may be of high quality but if inaccessible it is of little value, whereas poor quality open space if it provides the only open space in an area can be of great value. The Study uses the following criteria against which the quality of open space is measured: • Well maintained; • Litter free; • No dog fouling; • Attractive place; • No vandalism.
1670	15	If three or more criteria are present the space is considered to be good quality, two or more is reasonable and where no more than one criteria is present the quality is deemed poor. On the basis of the above methodology the potential open space identified in the centre of Gamston would comply with all of these criteria and in particular my client's garden land, which is included within the designation, certainly complies.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1670	16	The Study assesses value on two sets of criteria: a) Site visit assessment data b) Other data and information. The value criteria used for the Open Space assessments carried out by Bassetlaw District Council are summarised below: Site Accessibility - Areas were judged good, reasonable or poor according the following barriers: • Busy roads • Restrictive entrances • Isolated locations • Insufficient paths into and across the space • Other barriers identified Safety and Security - • Secure boundaries (including internal separation between different areas) • Safety surface • CCTV • Located within the residential area or adjacent to its border • Overlooked throughout.
1670	17	In addition to the above criteria, the Bassetlaw assessments also considered the following criteria to further assess value: • Site quality • Context of site in relation to other open space • Structural and landscape benefits • Ecological benefits eg site designation LNR or SSSI • Educational benefits • Social inclusion and health benefits • Cultural and heritage benefits eg historic site or monument • Amenity benefit and a sense of place • Economic benefits
1670	18	There are concerns that some of the land that falls within the area Ref: 22/3 in the consultation document is not considered to fall into one of the identified typologies set out in PPG17. It is noted that part of this area of Protected Open Space includes part of our client's garden, identified by the Land Registry as Plot OS156 (See Appendix 1). This parcel of land does not serve any open space function whatsoever since not only is it private land, but it is completely inaccessible and there are no public views of this site or overlooking from any surrounding properties (see photographs below of the garden land in question).
1670	19	When assessed against the Council's own assessment criteria with respect to value, the site score poorly, particularly against the accessibility criteria and the additional criteria. It is accepted that the site in my client's ownership scores reasonably on Safety and Security but purely on the basis that it is a private garden and as such the boundaries are secure and it is within a residential area. It is therefore considered that this parcel of land should be removed from the area of potential protected greenspace identified as 22/3 since it is not considered to form any open space function.
1670	20	This representation has been submitted on behalf of Mr J Roberts of Idle House, Rectory Lane, Gamston. As a resident of Gamston our client supports limited small scale housing within Gamston over the plan period and this is considered appropriate given the size of the settlement. However, it is considered that the revised settlement boundary as set out in the Core Strategy Proposals Maps does not offer sufficient flexibility for the provision of infill development over the plan period. The settlement boundary for Gamston has been altered along the western boundary and rather than utilise Rectory Lane, the historic extent of the settlement envelope, the boundary cuts into the heart of the village. It is considered that this has been changed for purely policy reasons.
1670	21	Having assessed the methodology for the Council's Open Space Assessment, it is considered that the quality of the space is good, although this is based purely on the fact that it is a private garden in the ownership of Mr Roberts. In terms of the value of the open space, utilising the Council's own methodology, the site offers very little value as open space due to its inaccessibility, the lack of public views of the space or overlooking from private properties. We therefore object to the extent of the potential area of open space (Ref 22/3) and consider that land that forms part of our client's garden land should be removed (OS Plot 156).
1670	22	Although limited housing development is supported within the settlement of Gamston in order to retain the vitality and viability of the village, some of the larger sites put forward as potential housing sites that would require the settlement boundary of the settlement to be extended beyond its historic envelope are not supported.
1670	23	Given the Conservation Area status of Gamston the allocation of housing sites of less than 10 dwellings would be supported since this is more appropriate to the character of the settlement provided that they are within the old historic settlement envelope. We request that the parcel of land that forms part of the garden land of our client is not included as protected open space but instead is identified as a housing allocation for a single dwelling.
1670	24	Our client acknowledges that the settlement development limits, excepting any allocated sites that may come forward, have been consulted on at the Core Strategy stage, it is considered that the western boundary of the settlement has been dictated by policy reasons and does not reflect the historic boundary.
1671	1	Savills acts for Anglian Water Group Ltd in relation to its landholdings at Ordsall Road, Retford. Our client's site at Ordsall Road, Retford comprises the East Retford Rugby Club. This site has frontage onto Ordsall Road and an existing access onto this road. We believe that part of this site should be allocated for housing as it will secure the long term future of Retford Rugby Club. The site should be allocated for approximately 25 dwellings. This site is shown on the attached plan. The detail of this proposal is explained in our answer to Question 14 below.
1671	2	This site is referenced in the Site Allocations Issues and Options as 1/62 and is designated as „Potential Protected Open Space“. The details of the site are set out in the PPG17 Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (March 2010). It states in Section 7 under club summary: <i>“East Retford RFC The Club shares its ground ownership with Anglian Water (AW), owning just over half of the land and renting the remainder from AW. However, there are plans to adjust the land ownership and layout of the three pitches to better utilise the land available and meet current and future capacity issues. The current clubhouse is owned by the Club but is on AW land. It contains a bar area/small kitchen and three changing rooms with a smaller room for referees. The changing rooms and showers are thought to be of poor quality”.</i>
1671	3	As stated above, our client is the landlord for the Rugby Club and has been in discussions with the Rugby Club over establishing their long term security of tenure on the site. The existing clubhouse is in poor condition according to a recent survey carried out on behalf of our client and is in need of replacement. These proposals would involve the relocation of the existing Rugby clubhouse building towards the rear of the site. Planning permission was granted in 2009 for a replacement clubhouse building by Bassetlaw District Council (ref: 01/09/00199) but this has not been implemented due to a lack of funding. As part of these discussions there has been contact with Bassetlaw Council over accommodating affordable housing on the front of the site to assist in securing the long term future of the Rugby Club.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1671	4	We attach a plan showing the area of land that is available for development in order to assist in bringing forward this development. It is crucial that the „Potential Protected Open Space“ designation on the land at the front of the site is removed in order to allow development to occur on this frontage land. In turn, this would allow the future of the Rugby Club to be secured through the transfer of freehold ownership of the remainder of the land. This would then secure the long term future of the club and present it with the opportunity to access grant funding which is currently unavailable to due to the lack of security of tenure. Allocation of this site for affordable housing would meet a need of the town as identified in the recent residents“ survey that has been carried out by Bassetlaw. This showed a high percentage of respondents stating that there was a need for affordable housing in Retford.
1671	5	Based on the site area that is proposed approximately 25 dwellings could be accommodated on the site. This could provide a mix of house types to meet the varying demand for housing in Retford. This site would need to be allocated for affordable housing as there is no longer an “exception” policy in the adopted Core Strategy which allows for affordable housing proposals beyond the settlement boundary of Retford. If the site is allocated this would give more certainty to the potential development and the likelihood of improvements to the Rugby Club. Attached to this representation is a “letter of intent” from Stepford Homes stating their commitment to developing the site and discussions they have had with affordable housing providers. In conclusion this proposal would provide a number of benefits to the local community by: - securing the long term future of the Rugby Club; - allowing the Rugby Club to access grant funding due to improved security of tenure; - Providing much needed affordable housing for Retford.
1672	1	Unseen
1672	2	Option A
1672	3	No. Why: main drains inadequate. (Ask Severn Trent how many blockages in the last 2 years). Not how much more water rates they can collect. Ask Severn Trent criteria for coming out to a blockage!
1672	4	No. Why: same reasons show us an improved main drainage system and houses would be ok.
1672	5	249
1672	6	121, 122 and 123 original site A1 turnover to Retford.
1673	1	Our clients generally agree with the criteria in the Screening Methodology as indicated in the Bassetlaw Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation Paper November 2011.
1673	2	Option A: Spread between Worksop, Retford and Harworth Bircotes? Option B: Focused in just one of the above towns? In short, our client does not agree with the premise of the question. Policy CS8:Rural Service Centres of the Adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD identifies up to 10% (a residual requirement of 599 houses) of the District’s housing requirements will be delivered in the Rural Service Centres, through existing permissions and allocations in the Site Allocations DPD for the plan-period 2010- 2028. The reduction in the overall headline figure from the adopted position within the Core Strategy on the basis of a residents’ survey (the contents/ questions within the survey, and the percentage of respondents being unknown) is somewhat arbitrary.
1673	3	The Core Strategy document remains the primary document in the plan-led system, and was subject to scrutiny, public consultation and an Inspectors Report. It is my clients’ opinion that the premise of Question 35 is loaded, and does not bear up to scrutiny when assessed against the adopted position as set out in the Core Strategy.
1673	4	As previously stated when our client made representations to the Draft SHLAA and to the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies – Issues and Options Consultation, there is conclusive evidence of a severe shortage of affordable housing in rural communities which is not only creating hardship and social injustice, but also undermines the Governments’ aim of creating mixed communities of income and occupation; and to meet the needs of key workers such as teachers, health workers and others to live close to their work. On the other hand planning policies are generally very restrictive in rural areas in order to protect the countryside, reduced car journeys to urban centres and concentrate new housing near urban services. One of the Key facts as identified within this Consultation Paper is that there have been no affordable housing units provided within Elkesley within the last five years. This fact is reminiscent of the lack of affordability of rural housing within our communities, which is unsustainable and can only result in the future stagnation of our larger villages. This is surely a situation that needs to be resolved in the short to medium term, and seems to be an approach supported by the recent resident’s questionnaire.
1673	5	The Settlement Classification as set out in the Bassetlaw Core Strategy states that Rural Service Centres are rural settlements that offer a range of services and facilities, and the access to public transport that makes them suitable locations for limited rural growth. The Core Strategy hierarchy has clearly emerged from detailed analysis of the sustainability criteria of each settlement, and an assessment of the level of services and facilities. Having assessed the Bassetlaw District Council Services and Facilities Study - one of the suite of background studies to support the development of the Local Development Framework – it is clear that the settlement of Elkesley is well-served by a village school, employment sites, a village shop and a reasonable Monday – Saturday public transport service to the surrounding settlements, together with Worksop and Retford. Elkesley is therefore a sustainable settlement within the District of Bassetlaw, that has a wide range of services and facilities, and which is well-placed to provide a function to deliver housing development.
1673	6	The headline figure of 223 new dwellings to be allocated within the remaining plan period 2012-2028 would allow for approximately 0.7 dwellings per year across the 20 Rural Service Centres of Bassetlaw District. This level of development stagnation with these larger villages such as Elkesley (mid-2005 population of 875 persons: Nottinghamshire CC/ ONS) would only result in the further deterioration of our rural communities, with the resultant lack of support for the local schools, services and employment sites.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1673	7	Our client requires some clarification to this question. The text at paragraph 10.43 of the Consultation Paper states, in the first bullet point, that <i>On average (mean) 11 new houses could be built within the village up to 2028</i> ; however the Question asks <i>Do you agree that enough land should be allocated in Elkesley for at least 11 new houses.....</i> The differing phrasing of the words is not just semantics, but does give rise to some real confusion. If our client takes it that there is <i>only</i> to be sufficient land allocated for 11 new dwellings in Elkesley in the plan-period from 2012-2028 i.e. 0.7 dwellings per year, then they disagree with the assertion. If our client takes it that there is to be sufficient land allocated for a <i>minimum</i> of 11 dwellings (with a maximum of?) within the plan-period, then this is something to consider further.
1673	8	As advised, the client made representations at the draft SHLAA and Core Strategy and Development Management Issues and Options consultation events as to the likely level of housing development which could come forward to the identified sites. However, it is anticipated that some of the potential land budget of the identified sites could accommodate sports pitches, allotments and extra play area equipment in order to support any new housing development.
1673	9	Our client notes that the proposed outline planning application for a maximum of 33 dwellings off Yew Tree Close, Elkesley was refused under the Delegated Powers of Bassetlaw District Council on the 24th January 2012. This application was refused for reason of its prematurity to the adoption of the Site Allocations DPD.
1673	10	As stated at Question 1 of this consultation response, our client wishes to see the following identified sites developed in the plan-period up to 2028: In terms of Site Number 246 – Brough Lane, Elkesley – the Bassetlaw District LDF Final Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Volume 2 for Elkesley Sites October 2011, it was identified that this site was Suitable, Available and Achievable in the Plan-Period up to 2028.
1673	11	In terms of Site Number 248 – Coalpit Lane, Elkesley – the Bassetlaw District LDF Final Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Volume 2 for Elkesley Sites October 2011, it was identified that this site was Suitable, Available and Achievable in the Plan-Period up to 2028.
1673	12	In terms of Site Number 249 – Coalpit Lane, Elkesley – the Bassetlaw District LDF Final Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Volume 2 for Elkesley Sites October 2011, it was identified that this site was Suitable, Available and Achievable in the Plan-Period up to 2028.
1673	13	Our client has not identified any further issues that have not already been raised by way of this consultation response or the views expressed by the residents' questionnaire.
1673	14	Any audit of the quality and quantity of formal and informal public open space should be subjected to a detailed analysis of the existing stock within the District, assessed against national standards provided by Natural England, Sport England, CABE, together with provisions contained in PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation. Without this empirical evidence, it is impossible to assess whether any open spaces identified on the map should be protected from any future development proposals, and on what policy basis. In general, however, our client would be willing to enter into negotiations with the Primary School to extend their school sports pitches into their Site 246.
1674	1	In most respects the proposed criteria are supported. <i>However</i> , whilst due ^j consideration is <i>given</i> to landscape and nature conservation interests it is not clear that the same is true of heritage considerations.
1674	2	In this context Criterion 7 (existing built character) is supported but it is considered that its range should be expanded to specifically consider the impact upon heritage assets (as defined in PPS5) and their settings. At present the cultural heritage dimension is not explicitly stated in this criterion, but nonetheless it is clearly a significant consideration having regard to the Vision and Strategic Objectives in the adopted Core Strategy. Assessment under this aspect will require some careful judgement, e.g. allocation of a site containing an important but vacant Listed Building may assist in achieving a necessary heritage-led regeneration, but should be clear that redevelopment would not be appropriate. Equally considerable damage to the significance of heritage assets can be caused by ill-considered development within their wider setting. It is therefore important that the assessment of heritage issues is not limited as to whether a site is part of a heritage asset, but that it also takes account of any such assets in the surrounding area as their setting, and significance, could be harmed by development on the site in question -e.g. intrusion into a designed view.
1674	3	National Trust has no particular comments to express on the vast majority of employment sites suggested for the Worksop area, or indeed about the overall level of provision to be made in this locality.
1674	4	However, the Trust does have several concerns about site W1 -Manton Wood. The site is a large one and at its closest is just 500 metres from the Grade I Registered Historic Park and Garden at Clumber Park - Clumber Park also contains some 30 Listed Buildings and part is a SSSL Clumber is of course also a major open space enjoyed by around 1 million visitors each year -many from the Worksop area, but also tourists from further afield who utilise a range of local facilities and benefit the economy of the area. Although the Nathaniel Lichfield Report refers to site W1 itself being a Special Landscape and Heritage area it makes no reference in its assessments and comments to the proximity of Clumber Park and its significances.
1674	5	The Trust's concerns are exacerbated by lack of clarity about the scale and type of employment development that might take place on site W1. The report at various places refers to warehouse/distribution use, a business park, office use, mixed use and leisure uses (hotel and pub/restaurant). It is therefore very unclear what the opportunity is that is being identified here and how it relates to aspirations to bolster the centre of Worksop, regenerate and promote the retail core and revitalise the Chesterfield Canal Corridor.
1674	6	It appears to the Trust that office and leisure uses in particular would directly undermine the aspirations for the built up area of Worksop.
1674	7	Notwithstanding its 'brownfield' credentials this is an out of centre location and dependence upon road transport for people and goods does not make it the most sustainable of available sites and is in conflict with the Core Strategy.
1674	8	There is also conflicting advice about the size of the site that might come forward the relevant background report referring to an employment area of 15-20 hectares, the current consultation document to a site of 25 hectares – clearly there is a substantial difference between the two in terms of the opportunities to respect the significances of neighbouring properties and provide environmental mitigation.

Reference number		Answer
Response number	Comment	
1674	9	It is therefore considered that if nonetheless the decision is taken that the site, or part of it, should be allocated, then it will be essential that: 1) It is for a clear and specific purpose that does not conflict with the aspirations for the centre of Worksop – in particular the site is considered to be unsuitable for leisure uses, including in the context of both the Core Strategy and national policy as set out in PPS4;
1674	10	2) The size of the overall development area needs to be limited so that adequate ¹ , mitigation can be achieved – it is suggested that it should not exceed 15 hectares and ¹ that mechanisms (e.g. a legal agreement) should be secured to ensure that the remainder of the site is not built on at a later date but is subject to appropriate environmental improvements in accord with both its Special Landscape and Heritage Area designation and the nearby heritage assets at Clumber Park; and
1674	11	3) The matters referred to at 2) above should also be addressed through the preparation of a Development Brief, or Masterplan, for the site if it should be allocated. This should be the subject of consultation and include specific advice on matters such as building locations and heights, external materials, structural planting, hard surfacing and lighting.
1675	1	Langtree Group Plc. broadly support the screening methodology outlined within Section 2 of the document and with respect to the identification of Employment sites.
1675	2	In terms of the assessment of the quality of potential sites, this refers to the scoring mechanism adopted within the Employment Land Capacity Study (ELCS). The screening methodology then identifies 9 separate criteria, against which a “traffic light” appraisal approach will be taken, the sites with more “green lights” from each of the criteria being considered most desirable to allocate. The criteria includes an approach which includes a number of key areas being considered, including landscape, built form and community support. In general terms we do not object to this criteria set out however we do consider that an additional or amended criteria should be added which relates to “does the allocation of the site help to deliver the aims and objectives set out in the Core Strategy and in National Planning Policy”. Given that one of the fundamental tests of soundness in PPS12 relates to the compatibility of DPDs with national policy and overarching policy documents, it is felt that the assessment of the suitability of sites within this document should be considered on this basis in addition to the criteria set out.
1675	3	The Core Strategy, informed by the evidence base prepared on behalf of and submitted by the Council, has established a requirement for new employment provision over the plan period extending to 2028. The Strategy identifies that new and retained employment provision should be essentially centred on the three largest settlements of Worksop, Retford and Harworth-Bircotes (Strategic Objective S02). In our view therefore, priority for new employment allocations should be given to suitable, sustainable sites within and adjoining these key settlements.
1675	4	In the current Issues and Options document, the indication is that the three sites being currently considered for employment, including Langtree Group Plc.'s site at Manton (reference W1) would equate to a maximum development of 56 hectares. At this stage however it is unclear as to the actual development potential of the other two sites in question and therefore what actual levels of delivery could be anticipated on these sites. In respect of the W1 site, an indicative masterplan has been submitted (copy attached) which indicates a potential development solution for the site. In our view, at this stage, there is no compelling case that the remaining alternative sites can deliver the land indicated on the figure 4.1 for employment purposes. Regardless of this assessment however, it is also evident that the residual employment requirement cannot be accommodated, even in a best case maximum scenario, on two sites alone, unless these are to be the sites references W1 and W12 (notwithstanding the potential in terms of mixed-use allocations).
1675	5	In our view the Council should seek to allocate sufficient land to ensure that the requirement for Worksop can be reasonably achieved, and that planning for a higher level of employment development would not undermine the aims and objectives of the plan. Given the continuing difficulties in the economy and the need to seek to attract inward investment into the area, this suggests that an approach which maximises development opportunity and investment choice would be a sensible approach to adopt in this location.
1675	6	Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth (PPS4) (2009) sets out the Government’s approach to economic development and as such how Local Planning Authorities (LPA) should “plan positively” for such types of development. Policy EC1 of PPS 4 states that LPAs should base planning for such development on robust evidence in the form of economic assessments, including an assessment of existing and proposed employment allocations against the provisions of the PPS. Policy EC2 indicates that, planning for sustainable growth, LPAs should, among other considerations, prioritise brownfield sites and reflect the different location requirements of particular businesses in relation to access and proximity to markets.
1675	7	Langtree Group Plc. considers that a significant amount of employment land should be provided within or adjacent to the Sub-Regional Centre of Worksop, though this should be in accordance with the relevant aspects of the Core Strategy in order to be considered sound. In this respect however, the policy does indicate that “at least” 45% of the employment land provision should be allocated in this location. In that respect, an allocation above the 48 hectares suggested would not be contrary to the Core Strategy and would not undermine the overall strategy. It is considered that the opportunities offered through employment opportunities within the A57 corridor, with its significant investment opportunities and location close to the A1 should be taken where possible and the site W1 is clearly a site which offers this opportunity.
1675	8	Given the importance identified within the ELCS to the A57 corridor as an employment investment opportunity, it is considered that restricting such opportunities purely through an over-zealous application of the 48 hectare target would be unjustified and would undermine the overall economic ambitions of the district.
1675	9	Langtree Group Plc. owns the site at the Manton Plantation, which is identified as reference W1 within the Issues and Options document. In this respect, Langtree Group Plc. have continually made representations to support the allocation of this site within the LDF including submissions to the Core Strategy (now adopted) and an indicative masterplan/advocacy document to indicate how the site could feasibly be developed for employment uses.
1675	10	As identified above, sites should be prioritised in and adjacent to the main settlements and therefore a site such as Manton, in close proximity to the sub-regional centre of Worksop should be given significant weight in favour of an allocation for employment.
1675	11	In the interim, Langtree Group Plc. are satisfied that the site is contained within the document and is being considered as a potential site for employment allocation.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1675	12	We would also refer and reinforce the conclusions and comments made with respect to this site in the ECLS which states the following: • A further allocation of employment land to complement the existing provision at Manton Wood would be necessary to support the A57 corridor; • The A57 corridor is “generally considered to be key to Bassetlaw’s economic future”; • The site (reference W1) scores highly in an assessment of potential employment sites (28 out of 35 maximum); • Site is considered excellent in terms of strategic access, local road access, compatibility of adjoining uses and market attractiveness.
1675	13	Langtree Group Plc. have significant experience in developing, operating and managing a variety of employment sites across the region and the north of England/Midlands in particular. This therefore gives further weight to the potential delivery of the site for employment uses, given that its delivery would not necessarily be dependent on third-party commercial developers. In this case, the landowners are not only the current landowners but developers and employment space operators of proven experience and track record including in relative proximity to this area.
1675	14	As can be seen from the indicative masterplan submitted, there would be no assumption in such an allocation that the existing plantation would be promoted for specific development and this woodland area would be retained and managed in the future. In this respect the proposed development of the site would not unduly impact on the surrounding landscape and the current small area of the site which is affected by the Local Wildlife site. In this respect, Ecological Assessments and appropriate habitat mitigation and/or relocation would be proposed where necessary and ensure that this impact would be negligible.
1675	15	The retention of the surrounding woodland would also, in addition, provide an existing natural screen to the development of the site and prevent the visual impact of the new buildings extending beyond the immediate area of the site.
1675	16	Langtree Group Plc. considers that the site in question would score highly on the nine criteria identified within the screening methodology and in most cases would reasonably be considered as a “green” or amber score in this regard. We have considered this impact in more detail in the attached table figure 1. Langtree Group Plc. therefore strongly support the allocation of site W1 for employment purposes and, whilst the current suggestions within the ELCS indicate that this location is likely to be attractive in particular to the storage and distribution market, consider that the allocation should facilitate the development of all employment uses within the B uses classes, subject to the usual development management policies and other material considerations.
1675	17	We consider that the Council should make specific reference and consideration to the emerging Planning Policy context, at a national and (consequently) regional level. The Government anticipates that the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) will be formally published before the end of March 2012 (and likely sooner) which clearly will have implications as to the soundness of the Site Allocations DPD. Since the NPPF will superseded and replace all current PPS and PPG, this will form the basis of planning policy at a national level. Hence, in order for the DPD to be considered sound with respect to its consistency with national policy, the document should pay due regard to the likely content of the NPPF. In addition, should the final published version of the NPPF make specific alterations these will need to be taken into account on later consultation version of the DPD. At this stage, the NPPF makes a number of policy statements with specific regard to the development of employment generating land uses. At its heart is a pro-growth approach to development all types, planning for prosperity which assumes that the planning system to deliver the jobs (and therefore businesses to provide such jobs) to ensure a sustainable economic future.
1675	18	With respect to sustainable economic growth, the Government’s objectives include to “plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century”, whilst the policy also indicates that “Policies should be flexible enough to accommodate requirements not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances”. In that sense, the policies clearly support a proactive approach to planning for economic development and ensuring that potential business investment in an area is not unduly constrained by inflexible local planning policies. In this respect, with reference to our earlier statements regarding the amount of employment land, this supports an approach which allows greater flexibility and an ability to encourage additional employment development in increasingly favourable market conditions.
1675	19	Given the likely publication of this document, which is unlikely to involve any fundamental changes to the principles surrounding economic development, we consider that the Council should take due attention to this document as part of its considerations in drawing up its Preferred Options (and subsequent Submissions Version) for the Site Allocations DPD.
1676	1	The ‘screening approach’ should be renamed to stop the confusion with ‘screening opinion’. Not all criteria should be weighted the same and it should be recognised that some judgements are subjective and hence it will be for the decision maker to justify their approach by reference to the appropriate evidence base.
1676	2	We agree that the methodology criteria set out in section 2 of the Site Allocations Issues and Options paper is suitable to identify sites for allocation for future development.
1676	3	The following table provides an assessment of site ref: 266 Retford Road, Blyth against the methodology criteria:
1676	4	1) The level of community support is unknown at the present time as no public consultation has been undertaken. DLP did try and consult with the Parish Council but they were unwilling to meet with us considering that the most appropriate course of action would be to submit a planning application to the local planning authority.
1676	5	2) <i>Green. Compatible with existing and/or proposed neighbouring land uses:</i> The allocation of this site for residential purposes would be compatible with the neighbouring residential land uses to the north and west
1676	6	4) <i>Green. No Impact on agricultural land:</i> The site is derelict open land and will not result in the loss of high quality agricultural land.
1676	7	5) <i>Green. Not a Source Protection Zone:</i> The site does not fall within such a protection zone
1676	8	6) <i>Green. No negative impact on Landscape Character:</i> The site is located on the eastern boundary of the settlement and is away from the south western boundary of the settlement which has been identified as having a sensitive landscape character in the Landscape Settlement Study.
1676	9	7) <i>Green. Enhancement to the built character of the settlement:</i> Development of a small scale housing scheme utilising quality architecture will enhance the eastern boundary of the settlement. The public footpath through the site will be retained thereby keeping the existing linkages with other parts of the settlement.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1676	10	8) <i>Amber. Some loss of green infrastructure:</i> Although development of the site will result in some loss of green infrastructure within the settlement, this site does not represent high quality open or recreation space neither is it of high ecological value.
1676	11	9) <i>Green. No identified and unresolved constraints:</i> There are no constraints on the site that cannot be resolved. Highways and noise in particular have been considered and there are no particular issues that would prevent development.
1676	12	Overall the site is considered to score highly as a potential housing allocation. Those issues that have been identified can be overcome and it is considered that the site is suitable for residential development.
1676	13	The adopted Core Strategy sets out an overall housing requirement for the Rural Service Centres of 770 dwellings, 10% of the housing requirement of the District. The residual requirement for the Rural Service Centres over the plan period is 328 dwellings, however based on local consultation the Council have only proposed to allocate 222 dwellings. The proposed numbers of allocations in each of the individual settlements does not always reflect the size of that development and it is considered that there are opportunities to allocate sufficient sites to meet with the Core Strategy residual requirement of 328 dwellings over the plan period.
1676	14	Given the rural nature of the District, it is considered important that the housing requirements of the rural settlements is catered for and this can best be met by allocating sufficient land in the most sustainable settlements. The numbers proposed for each settlement do not appear to have been based on a robust evidence base and have relied on what local residents think should be accommodated in their individual settlement. DLP have assessed each of the settlements and suggested a housing requirement based on the percentage population of each service centre against the total population for all rural service centres.
1676	15	It is therefore considered that in the case of Blyth, which is the second largest rural service centre in the District, land should be allocated for at least 26 new houses. The settlement supports a primary school, a number of pubs and hotels, a Co-op food store and other services. This level of housing development is considered to be commensurate with the size of the settlement and there appear to be a number of suitable sites, including our client's that could accommodate this number of dwellings. Even if it transpires following further detailed examination of the constraints and market conditions that particular sites, including the site on Retford Road would support less than 10 dwellings, the settlement boundary should be revised in order to allocate such sites.
1676	16	<i>Site Ref: 178.</i> The SHLAA assessment considers that this site is suitable for development, however it has identified that the site has a high chance of archaeological remains from the medieval settlement. The site is also adjacent to the Blyth Conservation area and therefore any residential development would need to be sensitively designed to take account of this.
1676	17	There is extant outline permission on the site for a single dwelling which expires in May 2012.
1676	18	The SHLAA assessment considers that the site could accommodate 20 dwellings based on development of 90% of the site at 30 dwellings to the hectare. This is considered to be too high given its proximity to the Conservation Area and its edge of settlement location. A lower density development would be more appropriate and would be more in line with the number of houses required to be delivered during the plan period in Rural Service Centres.
1676	19	<i>Site Ref 213.</i> The main constraint to the development of this site are the electricity pylons that cross the site, although the SHLAA assessment concludes that if these can be incorporated into any future scheme the site would be suitable for housing. However, this could prove costly and challenge the viability of any future development.
1676	20	The site is also within the historic core of the settlement with a medium to high chance of archaeological remains on the site. Development of this site would represent a large extension to Blyth and on the Council's assessment based on a density of 30dph, this would represent 104 dwellings. Blyth is a Rural Service Centre and the guidance in Core Strategy Policy CS8 is that future development in Rural Service Centres should be of a scale appropriate to the current size and role of that settlement. The site has an extant permission on it for a cemetery which would provide potential for the existing cemetery to expand. It is considered that this would be a more appropriate use of the site.
1676	21	<i>Site Ref: 214.</i> This site is to the east of Site Ref 213 on the A634 and has similar issues to Site 213, although it has been assessed as only having a low to medium chance of archaeological remains. Similarly permission has been granted by the Local Planning Authority for use of the land as an extension to the cemetery.
1676	22	This site is significantly larger than Site Ref: 213 and according to the SHLAA assessment could accommodate 189 dwellings, however as also stated there would be insufficient demand for this number of dwellings in this location. It is therefore considered that the site as a potential allocation is of an inappropriate scale for a housing allocation in Blyth.
1676	23	The development of both sites would also potentially have an impact on the landscape character given their proximity on the south western boundary of the village. The Landscape Character Assessment undertaken by Bassetlaw District Council assesses the landscape character in this location as very good quality and high sensitivity and should be conserved. Development in this prominent location would potentially have a detrimental impact on the landscape character.
1676	24	<i>Site Ref: 369.</i> This site is located to the north side of Retford Road and garden land associated with the existing dwelling. Although the SHLAA assessment does not identify any specific constraints, apart from potential flooding, although it is Flood Zone 1. It is noted however that there are a number of trees on the northern boundary of the site and the potential impact on these would need to be addressed if the site was to be allocated for housing. There would also need to be sufficient separation between any future development and the existing houses on Retford Road to ensure there were no harmful impacts on residential amenity. This together with the concerns regarding the trees, would reduce the number of dwellings that could be accommodated on the site and as such the Council's estimate of 14 dwellings is considered to be overly ambitious.
1676	25	<i>Site Ref: 589.</i> This site is adjacent to site 369 and access would have to be through that site. The existing house on the site would require demolition in order to achieve any development on the site. There are the same constraints on this site as identified in relation to site 369. The Council consider that the site could accommodate 6 dwellings, however in our view it is considered that the site could potentially only accommodate 2 dwellings but would provide a more comprehensive scheme if linked to the adjacent site.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1676	26	<i>Site Ref: 482.</i> There are a number of constraints on this site identified in the SHLAA that make it an unsuitable site for a housing allocation. The overriding constraint is that it is within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore at high risk of flooding. It is not considered that this site should be allocated for housing development.
1676	27	<i>Site Ref: 517.</i> This site would represent a significant extension to Blyth and as identified in the SHLAA assessment, it would require highways improvements to accommodate the number of dwellings that this site could potentially be allocated for. Notwithstanding the comments from the Conservation Officer regarding the quality of the design to take account of the Listed Building to the north, it is considered that this site does not relate well to the rest of the settlement being divorced from it by the A1 to the west of the site. An allocation of this size would be of an inappropriate scale with respect to the function of the settlement, particularly when there are other sites that could accommodate the housing requirements of Blyth during the plan period.
1676	28	<i>Site Ref: 590.</i> The SHLAA assessment considers that this site may be suitable for development, although consideration would need to be given to any future scheme due to the Listed Building to the east.
1676	29	The site is also again divorced from the main settlement by the A1 and as such it is considered that there are more suitable sites within the settlement identified through the SHLAA that would be more appropriate as housing allocations.
1676	30	In summary, it is considered that of the sites identified in the Issues and Options Consultation document as potential allocations in Blyth, Sites 178, 266 and 369 are most suited to be allocated in order to meet the requirements of the strategy.
1676	31	The site in the ownership of our client has been incorrectly assessed in the SHLAA as a protected employment site. This is incorrect. The site is a vacant greenfield site on the edge of the settlement and has no such designation. The assessment that the site may be available is incorrect since it is available. Therefore based on the rest of the SHLAA assessment, the site is considered to be a deliverable housing site.
1676	32	The owners have undertaken a masterplan of the site to demonstrate the level and type of development that could be achieved on the site. Two alternative layouts have been produced, one showing a five plot scheme with detached houses set in larger gardens. The sketch layout demonstrates how a landscaping buffer and appropriate acoustic screening could be accommodated on the site to mitigate the traffic noise from the A1. The alternative layout accommodates 19 detached and semi-detached dwellings on the site and again provides a landscape buffer. These two layouts are contained in Appendix 1.
1676	33	The applicant has sought advice regarding whether there is sufficient room to provide an adopted highway link from the A634 Retford Road. DLP Transportation has confirmed that a 4.8 metre road with 2 metre footway can be achieved in accordance with the 6Cs Design Guide. This advice letter is contained in Appendix 2. The existing public footpath across the site has been incorporated into the masterplan for the site and can therefore be retained.
1676	34	Wilkins Hammond, Chartered Surveyors have prepared a Market Research Report with respect to the site and conclude that given the need to provide a landscape buffer and acoustic screen, this would sterilise a portion of the site and conclude that on balance a small scheme of large family houses is likely to suit the site best in terms of both the environment, land take and market.
1676	35	A noise assessment has been undertaken and the preliminary findings are that although the site falls within Category C, the noise can be mitigated through the use of acoustic landscape screening and the orientation of the dwellings. It is therefore not considered that this is a constraint to development.
1676	36	Although there appears to be nothing of ecological significance as the site comprises mostly of grass it is considered appropriate at some future point to undertake an ecological survey to support any future planning application. The site does not have any statutory designation and the SHLAA does not identify ecology as a constraint to the site. The photographs below illustrate the nature of the site.
1676	37	The areas identified in Blyth for open space are appropriate for the settlement. This particular issue does not directly impact on our client's land since it is not identified as a potential protected open space area.
1676	38	This representation has been submitted by DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of UC Holdings Ltd who is the landowner of Site Ref: 266 identified in the Issues and Options Consultation document. The landowner supports the site coming forward as a housing allocation and has included two potential housing layouts that this site could accommodate.
1676	39	It has also been confirmed by DLP Transportation that the site could accommodate a road of an adoptable standard with adequate visibility splays onto Retford Road. The noise from the A1 can be mitigated through the inclusion of landscape buffers and acoustic screening.
1676	40	There are no major concerns that would preclude development of the site. It has been highlighted that the site is not an employment site as stated in the SHLAA and therefore the site is considered to be deliverable. The masterplan for 5 houses is considered to be most appropriate and is of a scale commensurate with the size of Blyth and the function that it serves. Although a number of sites have been identified as potential housing allocations, not all of these are suitable for the reasons identified. Allocation of the site for housing is supported and the settlement boundary should be amended to accommodate this site.
1677	1	Focused on Harworth Bircotes.
1677	2	Yes if the adopted core strategy can significantly restrict the development of 'infill' properties on domestic garden land. It would be better to develop a small group of properties with good open space in a planned location than to continue to suffer the loss of existing gardens and open spaces that were once common and that are part of the village character. However, if the District Council is not able to significantly restrict the development of 'infill' properties on domestic garden land, then land should not be allocated since the number of successful 'infill' dwelling applications is likely to be greater than 11.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1677	3	Development of part of site 508 would be acceptable subject a significant part of the site being released as public open space. The site is currently protected open space but without public access.
1677	4	Development of part of site 142 and/or part of site 152 would be acceptable subject to good open space provision, good pedestrian/cycle access, and adequate off-street parking. Development of the whole of these sites would not be acceptable
1677	5	I am strongly opposed to development of sites 522, 523, 524, 486, 491 and 526 because of the adverse impact upon the Conservation Area and/or important views described in the Village Design Statement.
1677	6	Sites 108, 112, 150 and 503 have problems related to vehicle access.
1677	7	Sites 143, 150 and 503 would allow development close to the A57 and I do not think that the village should extend to the edge of the A57 bypass.
1677	8	In the period since this consultation process started the village store and the butchers shop have closed. This raises questions about the status of the village as a Rural Service Centre.
1677	9	Sites 145 and 146 on the village plan already have full planning permission. There is outline planning permission for more than 40 houses on the former poultry factory site subject to legal agreement. In total, approximately 65 houses are already approved in some form and are likely to be built in the coming years. Any site allocation would be additional to this.
1677	10	Yes, the open spaces on the map should be protected from future development.
1677	11	Other open spaces to be considered for protection from development are a) land surrounding Pond Corner (near Pond Farm) including the garden at Old Well Cottage;
1677	12	b) the Heritage Orchard (east of Top Cart Gaps and south of the A57);
1677	13	c) fields to the east and west of Great Lane south of High Street;
1677	14	d) fields between Low Street, Mark Lane and the former poultry factory site;
1677	15	e) land south of the village school and north of High Street (the extension to the school field and the former recreation ground south of this
1678	1	We are developing an interest in a site in Retford and write to propose its allocation for redevelopment purposes in Site Allocations DPD. The site is the Former King Edward VI School on London Road to the south of the town. As you will already be aware, this site as remained vacant for approximately 4 years at the time of writing and it continues to be actively marketed for redevelopment. At present, precise redevelopment options are being considered, and we would therefore wish to draw this site to your attention for redevelopment purposes generally, rather than for a specific end use at this stage. The Local Development Framework consists of the Core Strategy, to which Proposals Maps are appended, and within which it is explicitly stated that additional allocations will be sought through the Sites and Allocations DPD.
1678	2	Retford is identified as a Core Service Area in the Core Strategy and Site Allocations Issues and Options Draft. A Core Service Centre is the focus for levels of housing, employment and town centre development. We support the identification of Retford as a sustainable place for additional economic, housing and town centre development of an appropriate scale. Notwithstanding this, the Potential Development Sites and Open Spaces of the Retford Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation (Figure 5.1, Page 38) identifies predominantly housing sites (either committed or potential) and areas of Open Space as allocations. Beyond this, there is one large Potential Mixed Use Site and a Potential Opportunity Site. Neither of these latter two areas are located centrally in the urban area, or in close proximity to the town centre which is a fundamental consideration in the context of a number of commercial uses. Our view is that the Former King Edward School premise on London Road is a centrally located site within the area which is clearly surplus to the owner's requirements. It seems illogical therefore at this juncture not to seek its allocation for a future use which would benefit residents of the town and comply / contribute towards the aspirations of Retford in the Core Strategy and Site Allocations Issues and Options Draft as the focus for growth.
1678	3	We of course accept that the buildings on the site are Listed, and thus a heritage asset. Whilst this is clearly a potential constraint to its redevelopment, we believe that a development brief could be worked up in consultation with Conservation Officers alongside the various stages of the Site Allocations Issues and Options DPD to ensure its sensitive redevelopment. It is certainly not the case that redevelopment must conflict with the setting of the heritage asset.
1678	4	In particular, we note that Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy specifically identifies that retail development outside the town centre will be allocated through the Site Allocations DPD. To that end, we feel this suit is ideally located to contribute to this need, subject to suitable design and due regard to the heritage asset. I would however stress that, as above, a variety of redevelopment options are being considered at this stage - this representation should not be interpreted solely as a request for a retail allocation. This is simply just one of the avenues which is being explored, and an issue which we note with interest is not addressed in the Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation Draft.
1679	1	Happy with the approach and results for H&B'S.
1679	2	Whole community was given the opportunity to comment on the future development of our Town and yes, we are supportive of the outcomes.
1680	1	Well there's no time I find it very difficult to see what the requirement of extra housing is because I can't sell what's built and Bassetlaw Council has put in for 120 odd houses up at Ordsall, where are people going to work? What the town's short of is not housing it's industry.
1680	2	I have no objection to the develop of building on there as long as it goes in the right way. I mean that Palmer Road was always designated for opening up for building on land behind it.
1680	3	I strongly object to accessing it through Durham Grove because when I bought my land to build off the system was the guy owned the land and another guy were his builder. When I bought my land I had 10 or more options in Palmer Road of plots for sale and there were seven plots in Durham Grove.
1680	4	Now I chose Durham Grove because it was a cul-de-sac and it cost me more it was dearer to go in Durham Grove than it was to go in Palmer Road.
1680	5	I've no objections to sites 7, 37, 46, 309 and 512 but it's not been gone about the right way in my opinion
1680	6	Tiln Lane carries all the heavy traffic. I would have no objections if they got the bypass done. The Welham bypass, because it would take all those heavy lorries off Tiln Lane.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1680	7	One of my big beliefs is that the land is for the living, that's one of my best beliefs. But, there is another thing I won't be here to witness it, that if ever there is another war we shall be in deep trouble, we shall starve. Because we are using all farmland for building land. And I lived through the last war so I know what I am talking about. We used to go in farmers field and pinch a carrot and wipe it with our hands and then eat it.
1680	8	Well I'm talking about land down the bottom of Palmer Road, again. Unless provision, if permission is given you are going to have the same problems there with sewerage as they had in Longholme Road. Because in Longholme Road it wouldn't flow up, it doesn't flow uphill.
1680	9	Well I think there should be some areas should be protected. I wouldn't agree on every one, but you've got to have an overall balance.
1680	10	I am mainly concerned with that bit down the bottom of Durham Grove. That's the bit I am mainly concerned with. I don't think it can be stopped from building on it, but the access to it is, now I am talking here on heresy. I have been told that the developer in question put in for provision for Palmer Road to be opened up and it got turned down last year or the year before.
1680	11	The bungalow down Durham Grove that the developers bought had a covenant on it. Whether is still in force or not I don't know. The last bungalow on the left going down. There was a covenant on it.
1680	12	No, I don't think so. I am only concerned with the opening up of Durham Grove, if it is opened up and it gets permission, I shall be looking for compensation. And everybody down street will be.
1681	1	Ownership is shown as the Douglas Rupert Clark Estate which I do not believe to be correct, I understand my neighbours the Sticks own half this land and I do not believe the other half belongs to this estate
1681	2	I would also like to inform you that residents on the Drive have covenants preventing building on 309.
1681	3	How are you to overcome access issues from the Drive which is private and owned by the residents?
1681	4	You also refer to land being overgrown when in fact there are crops growing.
1682	1	English Heritage promotes a wide definition of the historic environment which includes not only those areas and buildings with statutory designated protection but also those which are locally valued and important, as well as the landscape and townscape components of the historic environment. This wide definition should be considered when assessing potential sites. From our initial assessment many of the sites fall within, contain, or are adjacent to a number of designated and non-designated heritage assets including listed buildings, conservation areas, registered park and gardens and archaeology. With regard to the latter, the importance and extent of below ground archaeology is often unknown, although information in the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record (HER) will indicate areas of known interest, or high potential where further assessment is required before decisions or allocations are made. In relation to specific site allocations, it is not our intention to fully detail all the potential impacts on the historic environment at this time; however we reserve the right to make further representations to any subsequent proposals that might adversely affect nationally designated sites, including their setting. The comments made in this letter should be taken in consideration when preparing the next iteration of this document. Most of the sites contained within this document have little information on how they might be developed, making it difficult for us to assess their full impact. Many also fail to identify the full extent of designated heritage assets that exist within and surrounding the site, which might act as constraints on allocation and/or development. We are keen that the preferred sites include development criteria to guide future proposals, which in some cases should include reference to the historic environment. There is a danger of allocating sites without such criteria and establishing the principle of development without guidance on the issues that need to be addressed at the planning application stage. In addition, the possible cumulative impacts of a number of site allocations in one location could cause significant harm to the historic landscape/townscape and should be fully considered. We also encourage you to continue involvement of heritage officers from Nottinghamshire County Council and your in house Conservation Team as part of this consultation process.
1682	2	The site allocations screening methodology as set out in Chapter 2 cites the use of SHLAA criteria for housing and ELCS assessment criteria for employment sites. Heritage assets and other aspects of the historic environment have been considered under these and it is noted that where constraints are considered by the Council to be able to be overcome, sites have been brought forward within this consultation DPD.
1682	3	We are concerned that there is to be no further analysis of the historic environment in identifying sites for the preferred options stage and as suggested in our letter of 10th October 2011, we consider it to be crucial to include a further criterion in relation to the historic environment at stage two. This argument is supported by our site specific comments, as set out below, whereby there are a number of concerns in relation to designated and non-designated assets and the cumulative impacts of multiple allocations. Lack of further consideration for the historic environment as part of the second stage process, therefore, may mean that such issues are not adequately taken forward.
1682	4	Where mitigation measures are to be proposed for sites taken forward, these should be made clear as part of any further consultation exercise, in order to assess how appropriate these measures might be.
1682	5	Site 9 is in close proximity to Manor Lodge (grade I listed building). We have previously raised concerns with regard to this site as part of the consultation process for the SHLAA with a post consultation meeting also held on site. At this time it was agreed that the setting of the Lodge would be a key issue and that any concerns would be addressed in terms of landscaping, design and layout and subject to the site not being built out to its full capacity, as well as incorporating a landscape buffer zone, layout taking into account key views of the Lodge and maintaining the character of the land on approach to the Lodge. We would therefore expect this advice to be taken forward and reflected as part of the preferred site allocations and a design brief for the site to be produced as part of this allocation. We note that in relation to capacity, this has already been reduced as part of the SHLAA process from 340 dwellings to 250 dwellings.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number	Answer	
Respondent		
1682	6	In addition, the allocation of site 30 for housing may also have issues related to setting of this asset and as such we would request a similar approach for this site as well. There is also potential for non-designated archaeology within site 30 which should be taken into account.
1682	7	Site 4& W9 is a large site which may have wider implications in terms of setting of assets including Osberton Park. It would be preferable for the smaller scale options to be considered (options 2, 3 & 4), subject to impacts on the wider historic environment being properly assessed and taken forward as part of a brief for the site. There is also potential for non-designated archaeology which should be taken into account.
1682	8	Site W12 may have similar impacts upon the setting of Osberton Park which will need to be considered.
1682	9	Site 35 is directly adjacent to Old Gateford conservation area and as such may have an impact upon the setting of this and the other designated assets within this area. It is noted that the existing housing estate is identified as poorly screened and incongruent with the special character of the area within the adopted character appraisal and as such this allocation will need to be carefully designed in order to avoid repetition of the same. In addition there is also the potential for non-designated archaeology. Similarly sites 26 and 28 & W6 may also have an impact upon this area and the latter site also has the potential for archaeology.
1682	10	Sites 23, 60 and 75 are within the conservation area and site 75 is also adjacent to two grade II listed buildings.
1682	11	Site W1 is a large site which is located near to Clumber Park (grade I Registered Park and Garden) and as such there may be issues with the setting of this which will need detailed consideration. There is a concern that warehousing type units typically associated with an employment allocation may be of such a scale that would harm the setting of Clumber Park.
1682	12	Development of site 153 and 585 should take into account the setting of the grade II listed Church of St Luke.
1682	13	Site 27 and part of site 3 are situated within a conservation area and are adjacent to other heritage assets, including the Whitehouses Inn (grade II listed building). It is understood that development briefs exist for these sites, contained within the 2009 Appraisal Document. These should be referred to and expanded upon as necessary if the allocations are to be taken forward.
1682	14	Sites 24, 37, 44, 51, 512 and R7 have the potential for non-designated archaeology which should be taken into account.
1682	15	We would raise concern with sites 180, 193, 204 and 232 as these all have the potential to adversely affect the setting of the Church of All Saints (grade II listed).
1682	16	Sites 180 and 193 have the greatest potential impact as they are directly adjacent to the Church and its grounds. Sites 187, 191 and H4 may contain non-designated archaeology which will need to be taken into account if these sites are taken forward.
1682	17	We note that there are large areas of land with proposed employment allocations adjacent to Serlby Park (including the grade I listed Serlby Hall). The setting of Serlby Park needs to be taken into account if these sites are taken forward. The building out of large 'shed' type buildings which is now commonplace with employment land may have an impact and as such needs to be carefully considered.
1682	18	Site 520 includes the grade II listed North House Farmhouse and barns and as such may affect the setting of this.
1682	19	Site 385, 174 and 176 all have the potential for non-designated archaeology.
1682	20	In 2009 Tuxford conservation area was designated as a conservation area 'at risk' and this was subsequently identified as a Priority Heritage at Risk site in 2011. As part of addressing national heritage at risk, English Heritage has supported, with grant funding, the current Partnership Scheme in Tuxford in order to tackle some of the issues within this area, including targeting key buildings.
1682	21	As a local service centre, the allocation of land for housing within Tuxford is inevitable and, indeed, is required to support the on going regeneration of the town and its historic environment. However, we are concerned as there are a number of proposed site allocations which would adversely affect the conservation area and its setting, as well as impacting upon other heritage assets. The allocation of such sites (and the cumulative impact of these) would be a significant set back in terms of the impact upon the historic environment and may affect efforts to address Tuxford's 'at risk' status.
1682	22	Specifically the following sites are of particular concern: Sites 126 and 235 comprise of areas of historic farmland (associated in part with the grade II listed farmhouse at 91 Newcastle Street) are within the conservation area boundary. This area, at present, forms a distinctive landscape setting to the Town contributing to its significance.
1682	23	Site 126 contains ridge and furrow as a nondesignated archaeological feature. The loss of this through the allocation of these sites would have an adverse impact on the character of the conservation area.
1682	24	Site 518 is also within the conservation area boundary and the development of this site for up to 9 dwellings may also have an adverse affect.
1682	25	Sites 493 and 127 are within the conservation area. Land to the south of Lincoln Road has been largely developed in the latter part of the 20th century, however to the north of this road, the area is mainly undeveloped and rural in nature and as such we consider that the development of these sites would have an adverse affect. This can also be said for site 117 which, although not within the designated conservation area boundary, development of this site, for similar reasons would diminish the rural setting of this part of Tuxford and may lead to future development pressure within the Conservation area boundary.
1682	26	Sites 492, 495, 114, 119, 124 and 130 are all situated within the conservation area boundary and due to the topography of the area form an important view point out of the conservation area as well as towards the grade II listed windmill and grade II listed 'The Mount.'
1682	27	Large scale development within this area has potential to harm the open and rural character of this part of the conservation area as well as the setting of these listed buildings.
1682	28	In addition, there is potential for non-designated archaeology at sites 492, 495 and 114.
1682	29	Site 123 has the potential to affect the setting of 4-12 Ollerton Road as grade II listed buildings. In addition, this site also falls within the conservation area.

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1682	30	We consider that site 122 and 490 as well as site 121 offer the least impact on the historic environment within Tuxford.
1682	31	Sites 93, 201, 80 and 79 all contain ridge and furrow as a landscape feature worthy of protection.
1682	32	In addition sites 79 and 80 are adjacent to 3 & 3A Debdhill Road and 8 Church Street (grade II) and there may be an issue upon the setting of these assets.
1682	33	Sites 101 and 496 both have the potential to contain non-designated archaeology.
1682	34	Site 178 is situated adjacent to the conservation area boundary and opposite Blyth Priory SM and a number of listed buildings – including the grade I listed Church. Therefore there may be issues with setting of these designated assets. In addition the site has the potential for archaeology.
1682	35	Site 590 is adjacent to grade II listed Mill Farm and site 213 is adjacent to Spital House (grade II) and as such there may be issues around the setting of these assets.
1682	36	Sites 478 and 541 are likely to have an adverse impact upon the setting of the Church of St Peter (grade I) and The Old Vicarage (grade II) as well impacting upon the historic inter-relationship between these assets. Extensive views of the Church are gauged from Main Street and as such the development of this land also impact upon its wider setting.
1682	37	The development of land for housing at site 161 will also have an impact upon the setting of the grade II listed pigeoncote at Blyth House.
1682	38	We consider that sites 398 and 399 are within the setting of a number of designated heritage assets, including the church of St Mary (grade I) Cuckney Motte and Bailey Castle (SM), The Vicarage (grade II) and The Ulvers (grade II) and as such development here is likely to have an adverse impact upon these.
1682	39	We have no comments to make in relation to any of the proposed open space allocations within Dunham on Trent.
1682	40	Sites 141,143, 145, 152, 486,491,508, 522, 523, 525, and 526 are all within, or adjacent to the designated conservation area and as such the allocation of these may have an impact of this designation which will need to be considered.
1682	41	In addition, site 152 may have an impact on the setting of Pond Farmhouse, pigeoncote, stables and barns (grade II) and site 525 is directly opposite East Markham Primary School (grade II) and again may impact upon the setting of this.
1682	42	We have no comments to make in relation to any of the proposed allocations in Elkesley.
1682	43	Site 401 has potential for non-designated archaeology.
1682	44	Site 407 may have an impact upon the setting of Pear Tree Farm (grade II), Hall farmhouse (grade II) and North and Rose Cottages (both grade II).
1682	45	We would raise concern with the allocation of site 534 in relation to the impact on the setting of the grade I listed Church of St Peter and in the context of the conservation area. Church Lane is a pleasant ‘back-lane’ and its character may be irreversibly altered in the allocation and development of this site for 5 dwellings as part of meeting the necessary Highways Regulations.
1682	46	With regard to site 410 (former Bramcote Lorne School), this is a grade II listed Building within the conservation area. We would be supportive of the allocation of this as a potential ‘opportunity site’ in order to bring this building back into long term use and thus secure its future. Any development of the site would need to be sensitive in recognition of the designated assets and their setting and we consider that it would be beneficial to produce a brief for the site as part of this allocation.
1682	47	Site 134 may have an impact upon the wider setting of The Homestead (grade II) as it is adjacent to historic farmland which contains ridge and furrow.
1682	48	Site 424 may affect the setting of Mattersey House (grade II), Church Hall (grade II) and Church hall Cottages (grade II).
1682	49	Sites 505 and 506 may have an impact upon the setting of the Vicarage (grade II).
1682	50	Site 540 may affect the setting of Langwith Lodge (grade II) and site 257 may affect the setting of Langwith House (grade II).
1682	51	We would raise concern that the allocation of site 501 would adversely affect the setting of the grade I listed Church of St Martin as the proposed allocated directly adjoins this asset.
1682	52	In addition the allocation of site 262 may affect the setting of the grade II listed Yew Tree Farm and the listed farm buildings.
1682	53	Site 239 may affect the setting of the grade II listed barn and pigeoncote at Westmoor Farm.
1682	54	We have no comments to make in relation to any of the proposed allocations within Rampton.
1682	55	There may be potential archaeology at site 224.
1682	56	The allocation of site 461 for housing may affect the setting of the grade II* listed Church of St Peter and Saint Paul.
1682	57	In addition there are proposed allocations (numbers 458 and 459) which are adjacent to a number of listed farmsteads – development of such sites will need to ensure that the integrity and setting of these buildings is not compromised.
1682	58	We would raise concern that the allocation of site 281 has the potential to affect the setting of the grade I listed Church of St Bartholomew.
1682	59	We would raise concerns with the allocation of sites 368, 442 and 438 as they all contain ridge and furrow. This is an historic landscape feature that is being lost and it should be protected wherever possible. It is estimated that since the Second World War around 80% of ridge and furrow, which is such a distinctive feature of the Midlands landscape, has been lost.
1682	60	Site 286 has the potential to affect the setting of the grade I listed church of St Mary Magdalene, and the grade II Listed the Old Vicarage and grade II Listed Manor House.
1683	1	Further to your consultations within the village I can confirm that the Parish Council does not support any development within the village
1683	2	Consequently does not support any of the sites identified by Bassetlaw District Council as potential Development sites
1683	3	No development within Sutton also arose from the Sutton's Parish Plan consultation and the Parish Council is committed to delivering this plan to the best of its endeavours.
1684	1	I can confirm that the Parish Council of Hayton have no issues to raise with the Sites Allocation Documents.

Consultation Individual Response Record

Reference number		Answer
Respondent	Comment	
1685	1	Gringley on the Hill Parish Council are of the opinion that no potential development land, shown as BAS0134 and BAS135 on the Gringley plan should be included within the development boundaries until such time that the Miller Homes development is complete.
1685	2	As you are aware of this development on the former detention centre site consists of 68 homes which may have a significant impact on the village infrastructure and lifestyle of existing residents. It is considered that the effects should be monitored over the next 5 to 10 years before additional land is earmarked.
1686	1	RESOLVED that the Parish Council support the previous consultation of residents via the Parish Plan of 2006 and the Ranskill Future Development Questionnaires that no future development takes place outside the village envelope.
1686	2	However, it was also agreed that any future planning applications for building within the village envelope would be considered on their individual merits.
1686	3	None of the sites as they are all outside the village envelope which has recently been re-drawn presumably to protect the land outside of the envelope.
1686	4	The Parish Council is concerned that extra development would seriously damage the infrastructure of the village.
1686	5	The drainage system has constant problems
1686	6	Parking problems
1686	7	The Primary school is full to capacity
1686	8	Too many villages are losing their identity and councillors do not wish this to happen in Ranskill.
1686	9	Whilst the Parish Council is keen to protect its Open Spaces we should point out that on the east side of Site 39/6 the Parish Council has planning permission to build a Community Centre in the future and are keen that the land is kept available for this purpose in the years ahead.
1687	1	I have attached our assessment, using the best available information, of the sites we serve. As identified there are no absolute constraints to development in terms of water supply, however, some sites will require infrastructure upgrades. These are identified as amber on the attached assessment
1687	2	There is the capacity of resource to serve the proposed growth for sites: 1, 7, 87, 91, 92, 110, 112, 114, 117, 127, 130, 134, 143, 151, 152, 156, 161, 165, 174, 184, 191, 207, 213, 214, 218, 219, 232, 237, 244, 246, 247, 249, 251, 258, 281, 282, 294, 295, 296, 303, 343, 282, 345, 347, 349, 353, 364, 398, 399, 407, 408, 423, 460, 462, 468, 481, 493, 496, 497, 505, 508, 511, 512, 516, 517, 522, 523, 533, 536, 547, 564, 570, 571 and 572.
1687	3	There is capacity of supply networks to serve the proposed growth for sites: 114, 134, 143, 161, 232, 244, 281, 296, 303, 282, 345, 347, 349, 398, 407, 408, 493, 496, 497, 511, 516, 533, 547, 564 and 570.
1687	4	Sites where infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve the proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required: 1, 7, 87, 91, 92, 110, 112, 117, 127, 130, 151, 152, 156, 165, 174, 184, 191, 207, 213, 214, 218, 219, 237, 251, 246, 247, 249, 258, 282, 294, 295, 343, 282, 353, 364, 399, 423, 460, 462, 468, 481, 505, 508, 512, 517, 522, 523, 536, 571 and 572.
1688	1	Further to your discussions with Janet last week, please accept this email as the formal withdrawal of the representations submitted on behalf of The Trustees of GMT Foljambe1996 Settlement in respect to their land to the East of Worksop. The Estate have asked us to confirm to you that the site (Kilton) is no longer available for any potential development.
1688	2	The comments in respect to Sturton le Steeple should however still be considered as submitted.
1688	3	The Estate asked us to withdraw all our submissions in their entirety and this also covers this area to I'm afraid.
1688	4	Option B Worksop
1688	5	Yes, given the sites available in the village it is supported that at least 11 dwellings should be allocated. Sites 454,455,456,457,460 and 461 demonstrate this potential.
1688	6	454,455,456,457,460,000
1688	7	Yes
1689	1	At this early stage of the process where so many sites are under consideration it is difficult for us to assess the impact of proposed development on the existing waste water and water supply networks. When proposals become clearer and sites are better defined we will be happy to provide an assessment of the development areas and identify any capacity issues.
1689	2	As an observation however, apart from large developments we rarely expect significant problems with accepting additional foul sewage flows from new development provided that storm water is managed in a sustainable manner.
1689	3	Similarly with water supply, although sufficient resources are available in the area, local reinforcements are likely to be needed but the extent can only be determined by modelling the additional capacity on a site by site basis.
1689	4	Although the Bassetlaw area is comprehensively covered by Severn Trent Water for sewerage Severn Trent only partially covers the area for water supply, and for the area that includes Retford you should also consult with Anglian Water.
1689	5	As your plan progresses we will be happy to plan the provision of the necessary infrastructure with other organisations such as the Environment Agency to ensure that a coordinated plan is put in place, but please do not hesitate to contact us if you need a further explanation at this stage.