

Reference No	Name	Organisation	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response
Duty to Cooperate				
DBLP37		Marine Management Organisation	As the marine planning authority for England the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring tides mark, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark. Marine plans will inform and guide decision makers on development in marine and coastal areas. Planning documents for areas with a coastal influence may wish to make reference to the MMO's licensing requirements and any relevant marine plans to ensure that necessary considerations are included. The East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans are relevant and cover the area from Flamborough Head to Felixstowe including the tidal extent of any rivers within this area. Only aspects regarding the tidal extent of the River Trent have been considered - suggest that the Council complete an interpretation of the Marine Plan. Recommend that the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans are highlighted as a regional policy document. This is due to the tidal extent of the River Trent, which is included in Bassetlaw District. The East Marine Plan contains a number of policies that are relevant: east plan policies may be relevant to policies 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 24 in the Local Plan: CC1, CC2, SOC2, SOC3, BIO1, BIO2, ECO1, GOV1. Recommend consult East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System for further information.	All relevant planning documents will be considered and referred to, where appropriate, in the Local Plan including the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans - these will form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.
DBLP57	J Thomas Cousins	Central Lincolnshire Core Local Plan Team	It is noted that, in both the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan and SCI, reference is made to West Lindsey District Council as an adjacent authority but not to Central Lincolnshire. It should be noted that, for planning purposes, whilst West Lindsey District Council retains its development management function, the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee and the officers of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team are responsible for producing the Local Plan for West Lindsey, North Kesteven and the City of Lincoln. May be appropriate to include Central Lincolnshire as well as West Lindsey officers in future Duty to Cooperate and Statement of Common Ground discussions. Have recently announced a review of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and look forward to discussing any potential cross boundary matters in the near future.	It is agreed that it would be appropriate to involve Central Lincolnshire officers in future Duty to Cooperate and Statement of Common Ground for cross boundary matters.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	There is no evidence at this time to doubt the Council that it has discharged its Duty to Co-operate and that its neighbouring authorities have not requested that Bassetlaw accommodate outside growth. Do not consider this should be the end for Bassetlaw considering its role in the wider area and its role as part of 2 LEPs. Bassetlaw has the opportunity to contribute to and, more importantly, capitalise on the wider growth of the SCR as a driver for growth in its own District. To capitalise on that growth the plan will need to be ambitious and not simply meet the minimum requirements of meeting its own needs for growth. Bassetlaw's overarching aim for the District should be to achieve a long mooted 'step-change' in its economic growth which will require a boost to the housing market to facilitate that growth.	The Council agrees that there is a need for a step change in the economic strategy and is planning to deliver a significant level of housing (well in excess of the housing requirement) to achieve this objective.
DBLP143	George Breed	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	BDC is part of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Housing Market Area (HMA) which comprises constituent authorities of Bassetlaw, Bolsover, Chesterfield and North East Derbyshire. There is also a recognised overlap between this HMA and the Sheffield City Region HMA with shared economic links. The Local Plan must demonstrate co-operation between authorities to meet unmet housing needs in full. A signed Statement of Common Ground (May 2018) between the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw HMA was entered into where Duty to Cooperate requirements on active and on-going engagement is allied to the preparation of a Joint North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw SHMA. Further details on the outcome of cross boundary work between the HMAs to establish whether Bassetlaw's OAN accounts for demand arising from the neighbouring Sheffield City Regional HMA would be welcomed - uncertain whether the plan fully addresses this key housing market relationship.	Comments Noted.
DBLP221	B Weedall	Gladman Developments	Recognise that the DTC is a process of ongoing engagement and collaboration, as set out in the PPG it is clear that the Duty is intended to produce effective policies on cross boundary strategic matters. The Council must be able to demonstrate that it has engaged and worked with its neighbouring authorities, alongside their existing joint work arrangements, to satisfactorily address cross boundary strategic issues, and the requirement to meet any unmet housing needs. This is not just consultation but effective cooperation to ensure that the Housing Market Area's (HMAs) housing needs are met in full. From attendance at other local plan examinations in the HMA, Gladman is aware that the Council has signed a SoCG. Recommend that this evidence be made publically available in order to demonstrate that the Council has effectively worked with its neighbouring authorities in order to discharge the DTC.	The Council will continue to discharge its Duty to Cooperate requirements throughout the Local Plan process. All Statements of Common Ground will become part of the Local Plan evidence base and will be added to the Local Plan website in due course.
DBLP255	S Green	Home Builders Federation	To fully meet the legal requirements of the Duty to Co-operate should engage on a constructive, active and on-going basis with its neighbouring authorities to maximise the effectiveness of plan making. The Plan should be prepared through joint working on cross boundary issues such as housing needs. The 2019 NPPF requires Plans to be positively prepared and provide a strategy which as a minimum seeks to meet its own local housing needs in full and is informed by agreements with other authorities so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated (para 35a). The meeting of unmet needs should be set out in a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) signed by all respective authorities in accordance with the 2019 NPPF (paras 24, 26 & 27). The Local Plan should be based on effective joint working on cross boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred as evidenced by a SoCG (para 35c). One key outcome from co-operation between authorities should be the meeting of housing needs in full. A key element of Local Plan Examination is ensuring that there is certainty through formal agreements that an effective strategy is in place to deal with strategic matters such as unmet housing needs when Local Plans are adopted. Bassetlaw adjoins seven other LPAs (Bolsover, Doncaster, Mansfield, Newark & Sherwood, North Lincolnshire, Rotherham, and West Lindsey). Bassetlaw is a part of the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw Housing Market Area (HMA) with North East Derbyshire, Bolsover and Chesterfield Councils. There is an identified overlap between this HMA and the Sheffield City Region HMA (including neighbouring authorities of Doncaster & Rotherham) with recognised functional economic links between the two HMAs. Bassetlaw is a non-constituent member of the Sheffield City Region LEP and a full member of the Derbyshire & Nottinghamshire D2N2 LEP. At the time of consultation no SoCG explaining cross boundary working was available. It is understood that the Council is proposing to deliver all its development requirements in its own boundaries and no requests to address the development needs of neighbouring local authorities have been received. From attendance at recent Local Plan Examinations for North East Derbyshire and Bolsover it is known that the Council has signed a SoCG.	The Council will continue to discharge its Duty to Cooperate requirements throughout the Local Plan process. A statement of common ground has been signed by the local authorities, which form the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw HMA (Bassetlaw DC, Bolsover DC, North East Derbyshire DC, and Chesterfield BC). Bassetlaw DC has also signed a statement of common ground with Mansfield DC. The Council intends to sign a statement of common ground with all neighbouring authorities and Sheffield City Region, subject to agreement of the contents, prior to the submission of the Bassetlaw Plan for examination. All Statements of Common Ground will become part of the Local Plan evidence base and will be added to the Local Plan website in due course.
DBLP287	M Lynam	Sheffield City Region	As part of the DTC the Council continue to work with other districts through the SCR Heads of Planning Group which focuses on strategic planning matters and evidence sharing. The continued participation will help ensure positive collaboration as the Plan moves through to implementation.	Acknowledgement and support of ongoing DTC is welcome and noted. The Council will continue to discharge its Duty to Cooperate requirements throughout the Local Plan process.
DBLP440	990764		It is noted that, in the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan and SCI, reference is made to West Lindsey District Council as an adjacent authority but not to Central Lincolnshire. It should be noted that, for planning purposes, whilst West Lindsey District Council retains its development management function, the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee and the officers of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team are responsible for producing the Local Plan for West Lindsey, North Kesteven and the City of Lincoln. It may be appropriate to include Central Lincolnshire as well as West Lindsey in future Duty to Cooperate and Statement of Common Ground discussions.	It is agreed that it would be appropriate to involve Central Lincolnshire officers in future Duty to Cooperate and Statement of Common Ground for cross boundary matters.

Figure 1				
DBLP51	S Tucker	Canal & River Trust	Welcome the inclusion of the Chesterfield Canal and River Trent on the key diagram. Believe this will help make decision makers more aware of the location of our network and where policies that affect our work may apply.	Support for the inclusion of the Chesterfield Canal and River Trent on the key diagram is noted.
DBLP90	M Grant	Lichfields on behalf of db symmetry Ltd	The Key Diagram excludes the site from the area identified to the south of Harworth & Bircotes. This is not clarified in the supporting text. Acknowledge that this is illustrative but if our assumptions do reflect the Council's position, this is misleading and inaccurate. It should be made clear that the strategy for Harworth & Bircotes includes land in Blyth parish and the location marker should be repositioned.	Figure 1 is indicative and does not show parish boundaries. It is inappropriate to focus on such a detailed, specific matter in the Key Diagram for one part of the District, as other detailed matters would also need to be shown making the diagram illegible. The matter would be better addressed elsewhere in the Local Plan.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Suggest that the key for Figure 1 is updated to make clear the mode of transport denoted by each demarcation.	The key used reflects standard practice for maps - a dotted line is rail services, a blue line is a water course and a solid line is a road. To aid legibility the rail lines, watercourse and roads are each named in the key.
DBLP207	M. Braithwaite	Robert Doughty Consultancy on behalf of J. Travis	Support Key Diagram, which identifies Misterton as a settlement in "Rural Bassetlaw".	Support for Key Diagram welcome and noted.
Context: Geography				
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Chapter 2 sets out a number of challenges facing the District over the plan period. The clearest geosocial challenges from a spatial planning aspect are the polarisation of wealth and deprivation within the District and the projected future age profile; and subsequent reductions in the working age population.	Comments noted. Chapter 2 acknowledges the significant changes in the age profile of the population over the plan period (para 2.4) and the varied picture of deprivation across the District (para 2.7).
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Paragraph 2.4 notes a "nuanced approach" to planning for housing need in Bassetlaw. It is not clear what is meant by 'nuanced approach'. The answer to the shift in demographic is unlikely to be nuanced at all, but rather, will come from a policy approach that seeks to change the direction of those trends beyond what the current planning approach has achieved. The retention of young people and attraction of in-migrants of working age will only be achieved through suitable job opportunities, provision of affordable and attractive housing to younger and working age people and through provision of vibrant and attractive towns. In terms of overcoming deprivation, the employment market and opportunities must be developed to reflect the skills and labour market of the area; the profile of the job market must be capable of supporting the employability profile of the District.	Bassetlaw is a large district with a wide range of development needs. This relates to the need to support local services and promote economic growth in both urban and rural areas , whilst also ensuring the character of each area is conserved or enhanced. This is a more tailored approach to planning when compared the current 2011 Bassetlaw Core Strategy which restricts growth in many rural settlements. It ensures that the individual development needs of each area addressed. "Nuanced" relates to the subtle differences in the development needs and character of each area and the need for the Council to plan for those subtle differences.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Welcome the recognition that the borough benefits from strong transport links by road and rail, including a strong network of public transport provision. Agree that it will be important to enhance sustainable movement.	Support for 2.9-2.13 is noted and welcome.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Para 2.14 sets out that Bassetlaw has a greater proportion of manufacturing workers than the regional or national average but that Bassetlaw has a lesser qualified workforce than the regional or national average. The District has a net out migration of its workforce. It will be vital to provide for that workforce and help retain labour within the District.	Comments noted. New planning policies relating to employment will address this point in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Does this statement need updating in the light of the announcement about the Cottam Power Station closure?	The next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan will update all facts and figures, including reference to Cottam Power Station.
DBLP172	J Buckwell	dha planning on behalf of J also O'Donoghue	Agree that the important challenge for Bassetlaw is to deliver appropriate investment in the local and regional economy to boost jobs and prosperity. Client's actions have demonstrated that they have invested and that there is significant scope for further investment and jobs growth at the site.	Your support is welcomed. Thank you for your comments.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Support Para 2.18. Agree that the District's challenge is to deliver appropriate investment in the local and regional economy to boost jobs and prosperity. Note the investment from SCR and D2N2 LEPS. However, the key to driving forward an economic step change for the District will ultimately need to be led by market forces. The Council must make sure that the opportunities for investors to deliver change in the District are seized; this can only be achieved through providing the economic conditions for growth; including levels of housing development to support that growth.	Support for para 2.18 is noted. Acknowledge that the Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure housing and economic growth can take place in the District in future. New planning policies relating to employment will address this point in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Not convinced by the approach at 2.19 that seeks to rely on home grown enterprise to boost economic production whilst facilitating sustainable out-commuting to the SCR. The key to the long term sustainable success of the District will be in securing inward investment into the District and the provision of goods and services to the SCR rather than the exporting of its labour market outside of the District. As above, the district benefits from excellent transport links to the SCR and D2N2 and has the ability to provide competitive locations for investment. Those attributes should be exploited to the benefit of the District.	The Local Plan is providing a balance for employment opportunities by allocating land for new economic growth to support and encouraging investment into the District. In addition, it is also protecting existing employment land and supporting rural enterprises in suitable locations.
Context: Policy				
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Broadly agree with the summary of the NPPF requirements for the Local Plan but have some concerns regarding whether the Local Plan is compatible with those requirements. Note that the NPPF requires the Local Plan to be drawn up over a 15 year time horizon but it also stipulates that 15 years should be from the date of adoption. Noting the Council's proposed adoption date of February 2021, consider that the currently proposed plan period should be extended to at least 2036/7. Consider that Part 1 of the Local Plan should indicate broad locations for strategic development and land use designations as per the requirements of the NPPF and this should include the locations of strategic site allocations	Agree. The Plan has been extended to 2037.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Para 3.7 notes its relationship in policy terms with the SCR and D2N2 LEPS. Support the Council's interaction with the LEPS - the aspirations to contribute towards the economic aims of the LEPS are being undersold; particularly in comparison to the previous 'Initial Draft' Local Plan which was predicated on the Council's bid to be incorporated with the SCR combined authority. The district is well related to the SCR and for the potential of Bassetlaw's economy to be realised, its relationship with SCR is fundamental, particularly with regard to the economic step change that was envisaged through the regeneration of Harworth. Both LEPS have set out plans to develop the economy of its respective area. The Plan references the D2N2 Growth Plan - the need for additional 55,000 jobs in the private sector 2013 - 2023. The D2N2 Growth Plan does not set out the requirement against an existing shortfall but the same region between 1998 - 2008 delivered growth of some 30,000 jobs including a fall in private sector jobs by 2,200. The Plan does not seek to commit to the contribution that it seeks to make to that growth to 2023 or beyond for the remainder of the plan period. To achieve its ambition it needs to invest in programmes which will support a step change in private sector job creation in D2N2. The LEP envisages this will include support to help business growth, access to finance and skills and innovation. The LEP identifies the need to invest in creating the sites and premises that will allow indigenous businesses to grow as well as attracting inward investors from across the world. The SCR Growth Plan identifies the need for more jobs to meet 'the Productivity Challenge'. The SCR sets out that the area has a shortfall of around 65,000 private service sector jobs, when compared with the employment density in other LEPS. Additionally 70,000 jobs are required to reach the pre-recession peak employment level in the SCR. Trend based forecasts show that the SCR will generate 27,000 FTE jobs over the next 10 years, this includes the expected decline in some sectors. Addressing this shortfall will necessitate the SCR increasing its expected level of employment growth by more than 60%. The SCR seeks to re-establish the economic contribution the area once made to the national economy. Based on the forecast growth in other parts of the country the SCR would need to create c.120,000 jobs to have that impact. The SCR sets out that of the shortfall of 65,000 jobs, over 60% need to be in activities not dependent upon local expenditure; including business, professional and financial services (and support) and ICT. The key to this economic growth is the inward investment from outside the local and regional area. Each area will have to significantly improve its economic performance which includes attracting growth and expenditure from outside of the local and regional markets. The improvement in economic performance over forecasted trends should include a significantly increased performance in Bassetlaw which falls within both LEP regions. But the Plan does not reference the growth plans for the SCR and it is not clear how it will support the aims of the LEPS and where Bassetlaw sees itself in the context of the wider regions. Needs to set out a clearer vision and plan accordingly. Concerns regarding the Council's proposed employment target and housing requirements and the lack of clarity regarding the formation of that target / requirement.	Acknowledge that the Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure housing and economic growth can take place in the District in future. This will include helping to address the priorities and aspirations of the LEPS. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment will provide a clearer vision and plan for employment growth as well as how that relates to housing growth.
DBLP60	S Lilley	Nottinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service	There are a number of references throughout the plan, to Neighbourhood Planning Groups; who make up these groups, what is their remit and will Fire & Rescue Services be considered when planning location of Fire Hydrants?	Details of Neighbourhood Plan Groups are displayed on the Council's website under 'Neighbourhood Planning'. The Council will advise neighbourhood plan groups to consult the Fire and Rescue Service on draft Neighbourhood Plans.
DBLP207	M. Braithwaite	Robert Doughty Consultancy on behalf of J. Travis	Note and support the positive approach the draft Local Plan takes to the role of Neighbourhood Plans to allocate development sites, such as our clients land off Fox Covert Lane, Misterton. The communities in Bassetlaw have, with the support of Bassetlaw District Council, grasped the opportunity presented by Neighbourhood Planning and are bringing forward a number of positive plans, not least the submission draft plan at Misterton.	Support for Neighbourhood Plans is noted and welcome.

DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		A typing error under the paragraph "Eight neighbourhood plans are currently under development". The parish is called ScRooby, not Scooby	Acknowledge the typing error. This will be addressed in the next version of the Local Plan.
Vision and Objectives				
DBLP31	Clir J Ogle		Most is aspiration and unachievable by BDC. Health and wellbeing of residents will not improve by building in the villages. New development is likely to increase density with urban extensions which will lower residents quality of life. Highways improvements are NCC responsibility. The present accumulated underspend on rural roads is £100-£150m. An increase in NCC budget of £20 was included 18 months ago to address deficiencies. The Clarborough Bole corner route is to receive an average speed camera. The Retford Markham Moor has an installed system. These serve travellers and increase safety on these main routes, drivers can be from Retford and Worksop and a percentage of rural travellers. It will be uneconomic with current technology to put speed safety systems on rural little used routes. The safety of the major routes is ongoing and financially justifiable and this should encourage residential to be put in the towns where residents can use improved safety routes. Allowing 20% increases in the villages is going to increase the number of dead and casualties by 20% at least - a higher death rate than on Bassetlaw main roads. Bus services in Bassetlaw rural areas are most subsidised in Nottinghamshire and services are sparse. Schools are provided by NCC. Many schools are academies which BDC cannot influence, as are health centres and other necessary community facilities. Advance high quality and reliable communications infrastructure provided commercially in Retford and Worksop. In rural areas BDC are active in microwave broadband provision but the superfast fibre optic has been facilitated by NCC with finance from government. Fibre to the premises needs to be provided now in the rural areas.	It is acknowledged that most infrastructure provision is provided and managed by external infrastructure providers. However, the Council work closely with these providers through Duty to Cooperate requirements to ensure that the infrastructure identified as being needed to deliver the Local Plan is deliverable.
DBLP74	S Beard	Sport England	Support Objective 10 to Promote Health and Wellbeing. Has Bassetlaw signed up to the Nottinghamshire Planning and Health Protocol - should this be referenced? One aspect of promoting health and well being is to ensure that Active Design is considered as part of the development process. In addition Strategic Objective 7 would be supported by Active Design.	This has helped to inform the emerging policy on Health and Wellbeing which includes reference to active design.
DBLP110	K Crisp	Cushman & Wakefield on behalf of Stancliffe Homes	Support the Council's vision which seeks to support development and growth of both the rural and the urban areas of Bassetlaw.	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Support - it supports significant levels of growth for the District, but that level of growth must be significantly increased. Support the delivery of large scale sites. But the Plan must focus development towards the District's main settlements to support their role and function as service centres; not only for their own populations but their surrounding rural hinterlands. It is more appropriate for the Council to seek to deliver 'sustainable urban extensions' which are defined by their sustainability benefits rather than solely through scale.	Objective 2 provides for a range of housing sites which could include sustainable urban extensions.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Disagree - Whilst it is vital to maintain the vitality and viability of existing rural settlements the rural areas and smaller settlements are not a sustainable location in which to meet the borough-wide needs for development. The main settlements in the district should be the focus for growth - Retford to be the main hub for the rural centre and east which contributes greatly to the sustainability of the District's rural areas and settlements for meeting their day to day needs and as a transport hub. This role should remain and be enhanced through the Local Plan. Note the Council's desire to follow the 'garden village movement' do not consider that there is a driver for doing so in Bassetlaw. The garden village movement was driven by overcrowding in urban areas and a need to house significant amounts of people in new sustainably designed settlements. Bassetlaw does not suffer from those urban problems and its main settlements are suitable for urban expansion and, as above, would benefit from additional growth to maintain and enhance their vitality and viability. Additional growth will be vital as the current population of those towns ages and the number of working age people naturally declines; it will be vital to encourage younger people and families to those towns.	Disagree. Rural communities need to remain sustainable. The Council will continue to work with rural communities to support the delivery of sustainable development in rural areas. It should be noted that the Economic Development Needs Assessment identifies that a large percentage of employment in Bassetlaw is located in the rural area. Rampton Hospital employs approximately 2000 staff. There are also other large employers in the rural area, for example Ranby Prison, Power Stations, schools etc. It is essential that the Plan supports local businesses and local communities.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Support - The mechanism for achieving growth requires more detail, and more growth.	Acknowledge that the Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure economic growth can take place in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment will provide a clearer vision and plan for employment growth as well as how that relates to housing growth.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Support - it is important to stress the opportunities that new development will provide in terms of unlocking existing development opportunities where infrastructure constraints might exist.	Comments noted.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard	The plan proposes a vision for the District up to 2035 which must be extended to include a plan period of at least 15 years from the date of adoption in line with the requirements of the NPPF. With a predicted adoption date of 2021 the plan period should at least extend to 2036/37.	LP will be made in line with the requirements of the NPPF so the adoption date will be extended to 2037
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Agree with the vision that the District should strive to be a place that prospers from investment and growth. Consider that there will need to be a step change in the level of economic and housing growth that Bassetlaw plans for over the plan period.	Acknowledge that the Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure economic growth can take place in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment will provide a clearer vision and plan for employment growth as well as how that relates to housing growth.
DBLP148	R Flounders	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	Support - which states that development in Bassetlaw will be distributed across the district ensuring towns and villages grow at a rate and scale commensurate to their defined role.	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP151	D Kitson	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	There are 10 strategic objectives, all of which are relevant and correct to some degree. Good to see that Objective 2 the needs of an ageing population are identified but less sure that this has translated into meaningful and positive policies.	Acknowledge that the Local Plan should ensure the needs of an ageing population can be met in future. Planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan will better address specialist housing needs.
DBLP151	D Kitson	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	Objective 6 talks about promoting rural Bassetlaw as a living and working landscape. Need to look away from agriculture as the main employer. Tourism has its place and there are existing examples of good tourist related activities in the district. Need to do more to attract would be employers into the countryside. Bassetlaw is not a large district nor is it poorly served by the road network. Have the A1, the M1 on western boundary and other major arterial roads heading east, west, south and north to South Yorkshire and all the opportunities that it brings including Doncaster Sheffield Airport. No longer have great tracts of land in Retford for commercial development nor do have much in the way of rural employment. For this objective to succeed this needs addressing - should not follow the traditional "farming diversification" route. Radical innovative thinking needs to be employed to identify land that could be brought forward for employment, not necessarily nor immediately related to agriculture. Centering employment on the main conurbations does not help the rural economy, it simply increases journeys to work, results in congestion in our towns and place a greater financial burden on employees that do live in the countryside.	Acknowledge that the Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure economic growth can take place in the rural area in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to rural employment will provide a clear vision and approach for the consideration of rural employment in the future.
DBLP172	J Buckwell	dha planning on behalf of Laing O'Rourke	Fully support. Facilitating development opportunities that will enhance Bassetlaw's economy through the delivery of new and the expansion of existing enterprises, providing jobs across urban and rural Bassetlaw. Further development at EIP can help to deliver this vision.	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP173	J Cox	Lichfields on behalf of SP Scholey and the estate of WA Scholey	Support the Vision and welcome its aspiration for growth. Support the strategic objectives which acknowledge that the Local Plan will seek to achieve 'significant new housing growth' in a balanced pattern across both urban and rural areas. Note the delivery of two new garden villages as one of the strategic objectives and agree with the principle that these have the potential to improve the sustainability of the wider rural area. This principle is equally applied to Strategic Objective 10, whereby other forms of large scale development are capable of enhancing the sustainability of existing towns and villages in Bassetlaw e.g. Folly Nook Lane, Ranskill which is committed to delivering affordable housing, open space and local bus stop improvements.	Support welcome and noted.

DBLP173	J Cox	Lichfields on behalf of SP Scholey and the estate of WA Scholey	As part of Strategic Objective 4, welcome the support for economic growth in Bassetlaw. It is important that the proposed level of housing growth reflects the wider aspirations for Bassetlaw, including in terms of economic growth. As currently drafted, unconvinced that the draft Local Plan has adequately addressed this point.	Acknowledge that the Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure economic growth can take place in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to rural employment will provide a clear vision and approach for the consideration of employment growth in the future.
DBLP179	W Lam	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Support the vision and objectives - consider that this approach will contribute to securing sustainable development in Bassetlaw and contribute appropriately towards the wider Sheffield City Region and D2N2 Region. Note the two proposed garden villages near to Elkesley at Gamston Airport and the former Bevercotes Colliery site and are willing to share experiences, with respect to allocating the Basingthorpe Farm Strategic Allocation in the adopted Rotherham Core Strategy, and the preparation of its evidence base to support this allocation through the independent examination of the Local Plan.	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP182	D Bramley	Severn Trent Water Ltd	In principle support the strategic objectives. The majority of the District are provided potable water by Anglian Water there are areas that are served by Severn Trent, note that one of the strategic objectives is that new development will deliver improved water efficiency. Severn Trent are fully supportive of this approach.	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP183	R Millbank	Environment Agency	Supportive of the draft vision, it would be good to have a standalone element for nature, rather than the current wording which puts it in the context of people being able to enjoy it. Suggest the following text could be incorporated into the paragraph: "The rich environmental assets of the area will be protected, enhanced and extended, allowing residents and visitors to enjoy a valuable, attractive, diverse and accessible environment."	The draft vision will be expanded to better reflect the content of the emerging Local Plan and its full range of policies.
DBLP183	R Millbank	Environment Agency	Suggest that the protection and enhancement of the Natural Environment should be given more weight, either by way of its own strategic objective or additional wording is added. This would add further weight and importance to the content of Chapter 15, but would go some way to ensuring the Plan helps deliver the aspirations of the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan. Suggest the following wording, which could be added to Strategic Objective 5, or given its own strategic objective: "The natural environment and biodiversity will be protected, restored, enhanced and created, with an emphasis on building stronger connections between sites and the creation of new sites while maintaining the current biodiversity infrastructure to provide a robust natural environment for future generations to enjoy. Rivers and waterbodies will be protected, enhanced and restored with the aim that they achieve Good Ecological Status in line with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (WFD), contributing positively to biodiversity networks and wider enjoyment of the District's diverse waterside habitats." Included reference to the WFD as the District supports several major waterbodies, all of which are currently falling under WFD -this more ambitious objective should be set, to ensure that the environment benefits from new development and growth.	Protecting and enhancing the environment is an important objective of the Local Plan. Therefore Objective 5 will be strengthened accordingly. However, it is considered that reference to the WFD would sit better alongside the relevant thematic policies.
DBLP183	R Millbank	Environment Agency	Objective 8 reads well. Encourage reference to potential flood schemes and the use of Natural Flood Management (NFM) techniques. Development of wetland habitat as part of the flood mitigation process, reconnecting rivers with floodplains, is an integral part of flood management. Suggest the following addition: 'Opportunities will be sought for new development to contribute to improved flood mitigation schemes, including Natural Flood Management (NFM) techniques which should be applied at a catchment wide scale, or the development of wetland habitat which reconnects rivers to their floodplains.'	Protecting and enhancing the environment is an important objective of the Local Plan. The Objective will be strengthened accordingly. However, it is considered that reference to flood mitigation would sit better alongside the relevant thematic policies.
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	Welcome objective 5 which aims to conserve the District's historic and natural environments. Welcome objective 8 which supports increasing resilience to climate change. Support objective 10 which supports new and enhanced infrastructure which will improve the quality of life in Bassetlaw, this includes the provision of new and enhanced natural and semi-natural green space that will provide benefits for people and wildlife. Advise that the vision and emerging development strategy should address impacts on and opportunities for the natural environment and set out the environmental ambition for the plan area. The plan should take a strategic approach to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment, including providing a net gain for biodiversity, considering opportunities to enhance and improve connectivity. Where relevant there should be linkages with the Biodiversity Action Plan, Local Nature Partnership, Rights of Way Improvement Plans and Green Infrastructure Strategies.	Support for objectives 5, 8 and 10 is welcome and noted. Revised and new planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to the natural environment will be clearer about the environmental ambition for the District and will reference all relevant supporting documents accordingly.
DBLP191	K Miller	National Trust	Support Objective 5 and Objective 8.	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP192	B Lomas	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	Supported. In order to achieve the vision consider that the Local Plan should take a proactive approach to development in order to gain the necessary boost and investment needed to enhance health, wellbeing and quality of life. Policies should look to encourage opportunities and where possible remove barriers to the delivery of development. It is important that the strategic objectives make specific reference to different types of housing markets in the District with an objective included to refer to the regeneration requirements of parts of the District, in particular Harworth. This is connected with the spatial strategy strands in Section 5.	The emerging Local Plan will take a proactive approach to development to ensure that the right conditions are in place to help deliver the infrastructure and sites needed to meet objectively assessed needs in the District. The objectives are strategic so while reference to regeneration can be added specific reference to particular areas of the District will be best left to the planning policies themselves.
DBLP194	H Leggett	Emery Planning on behalf of J G Pears Property Ltd	Support Objectives 4 and 8 and highlight that land interest at the Former High Marnham Power Station offers the Council a significant opportunity to help achieve these two key objectives in a sustainable manner.	Comments noted.
DBLP208	S. Weston	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	The loss of aviation-dependent businesses and development both contradicts and ignores two of the supposed Visions & Objectives namely:- a. 4. and 6. Therefore, the plan's proposals are the opposite of what is prescribed in paragraphs 4. and 6. in that closing Retford Gamston Airport removes, rather than expands, existing enterprises and fails to protect the intrinsic character of the countryside given that the airfield has been an integral part of that since 1942.	It is acknowledged that should Retford Gamston Airport close some aviation businesses may have to relocate out of the District. However, the proposal also includes the provision of employment development. Objective 6 is designed to relate to rural employment such as farm diversification. This point could be clearer.
DBLP217	S Hayle	Axis ped on behalf of FCC Environment	Support Strategic Objective 4 which seeks to facilitate development opportunities that will enhance Bassetlaw's economy through the delivery of new and the expansion of existing enterprises, providing jobs across urban and rural Bassetlaw and Strategic Objective 6 which seeks to promote rural Bassetlaw as a living and working landscape, where new development responds to local needs and opportunities, and protects the intrinsic character of the countryside.	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP219	C Jesson	Planning and Design Group on behalf of the Welbeck Estates Company Ltd	The objective of delivering balanced development across both urban and rural areas is welcomed. This objective will help enable sustainable development in rural Bassetlaw. It recognises the predominantly rural character of the District and will offer significant benefit to rural communities by recognising their, often bespoke, development requirements. This is supported by the objective to promote rural Bassetlaw as a 'living and working landscape', home to more organic forms of residential and employment development. Rural growth opportunities are linked closely with the other elements of the vision e.g. with respect to enhancing design quality and building standards, a District that recognises the diversity of its housing needs, places that support the economy on different scales, and a flourishing rural Bassetlaw. The vision and objectives help the plan be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live, supporting a prosperous rural economy and seeks to be genuinely plan led, as desired by the NPPF. The objectives could more successfully achieve or take account of important themes and policy concerns and should be enhanced with: To make optimum use of previously developed and under-used land and bring empty and derelict buildings into reuse. To ensure the District's housing stock is decent, suitable and affordable, meets community need and is balanced with access to employment opportunities. Welbeck is a significant landowner in the District and has a unique, important role in delivering new housing, employment and environmental benefits through the development of sustainable greenfield sites or re-development of its brownfield sites. The longstanding ties that Welbeck has with local communities' means the delivery of high-quality development is important to create, and support, well-balanced and healthy communities.	It is acknowledged that the vision and objectives could better reflect the importance of using previously developed land and underused land and buildings. Objectives will be changed accordingly.
DBLP220	E Crookes		Objective 6 relates to the 'protection of the intrinsic character of the countryside'. Do not consider that it will be protected with 1000 houses concentrated in a rural area over 15 years and subsequently a further 3000 houses over the next 15 or so years. The proposed areas are close to local and regional popular leisure, heritage and historical tourist area with such attractions as the Dukeries, Clumber Park and Sherwood Forest. These housing developments will spoil the attraction to these unique places and locally will urbanise an area known for its rolling green farmland and beautiful landscapes.	The development of garden villages will inevitably change the character of the area. However, these locations will be designed to fit well within their landscapes. The Dukeries, Clumber Park and Sherwood Forest are some distance from the proposed garden villages so it is not envisaged that their development would create an adverse impact on these sites.
DBLP221	B Weedall	Gladman Developments	Support the positive and proactive approach to future development in Bassetlaw over the plan period to 2035 and the positive approach to new growth and the Council's decision to allocate a range of sustainable housing sites and the identification of two new garden villages which will provide a significant focus for growth and investment over the plan period (and also beyond the plan period). It might be appropriate to change '3. To initiate the delivery of two garden villages' to '3. To support the delivery of two new garden villages.' The success of the Garden Villages will rely upon a long term close working relationship with the Council across a number of disciplines (including planning) working towards the delivery of at least 1,000 dwellings within the plan period and after, which will require significant staff resourcing.	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP259	R Worrall	Historic England	Relates only to conserving the District's 'distinctive historic built and natural environments'. Since buried archaeology, known or unknown, is not necessarily 'built' heritage it is not clear how the objective and, Chapter 16 and Policy 21 address archaeology. One option would be to revise the wording of SO5 to read 'historic, built and natural environments' by inserting a comma, or revise to read 'historic built and natural environments and archaeology'.	Protecting and enhancing all the historic environment is an important objective of the Local Plan. Therefore Objective 5 will be strengthened accordingly.
DBLP267	D Backhouse	Sustrans Bassetlaw	Strongly support Strategic Objective 10 – delivery of new and enhanced infrastructure	Support welcome and noted.

DBLP270	D Troop		Review of the Strategic Objectives indicates that the outcome of the 2018 Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study, fails to comply with SO1, SO8, SO9 and SO10. SO1: Awarding equal % growth to 73 rural settlements does not represent "balanced" growth. SO1 is flawed in that its inference confers "balance" only within the context of the urban/rural split. SO1 needs to recognise that Bassetlaw is a rural district with diversity between rural settlements: SO1: Manage the scale and location of development to support a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas and between rural settlements. SO8: this needs to be altered: Increase resilience to climate change through improved congestion mitigation, improved flood mitigation, better energy and water efficiency and support for renewable energy production. SO9: This does not recognise the risks of congestion Enhance the vitality and viability of Bassetlaw's town centres and local centres via commensurate local development SO10: The NPPF differentiates between infrastructure to deliver health and well-being and infrastructure that will deliver sustainable development. The draft Bassetlaw LP does not make this distinction. SO10 therefore needs to change: Improve the quality of life, health and wellbeing in Bassetlaw by delivering new and enhanced infrastructure where needed – whilst making best use of existing infrastructure through well-planned allocations. SO3: Must be dropped. Delivery of Garden Villages is a delivery mechanism not a strategic objective. Housing delivery is the strategic objective and the 2017 LAA results have been ignored.	Thank you for your comments. The spatel strategy has been revised following comments from the consultation and further gathering of evidence. The information in the LAA is high-level and does not always translate into all "potentially suitable" sites being allocated or suitable for development. The LAA assessment flags up some known planning constraints, but doesn't always assess the detail and therefore is only considered a site management database tool rather than an accurate assessment of sites.
DBLP273	J. Rogers	Friends of Woodlands and Coachwood Green Ltd	The Strategic Objectives (SO) are well balanced but open to interpretation.	Comments noted. Changes proposed should help clarify points of interpretation.
DBLP279	S Roberson	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	The loss of aviation-dependent businesses and development both contradicts and ignores two of the supposed Visions & Objectives namely:- a. 4. and 6. Therefore, the plan's proposals are the opposite of what is prescribed in paragraphs 4. and 6. in that closing Retford Gamston Airport removes, rather than expands, existing enterprises and fails to protect the intrinsic character of the countryside given that the airfield has been an integral part of that since 1942.	It is acknowledged that should Retford Gamston Airport close some aviation businesses may have to relocate out of the District. However, the proposal also includes the provision of employment development. Objective 6 is designed to relate to rural employment such as farm diversification. This point could be clearer.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Conserve the District's distinct historical build and natural environments. Putting a blanket build requirement of 10_20% for rural areas such as Scrooby will put in jeopardy the conservation of its heritage.	Although heritage is an important issue, it should not preclude development in isolation. In terms of the impact of additional growth in rural communities, this will be based on their capacity to grow. A number of communities are undertaking work on Neighbourhood Plans in order to allocate specific sites for development which should be those that have the least impact on heritage and other factors.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Increase resilience..... How can this objective be met and still retain the build / type / quality of the smaller but exceptionally historic areas of Bassetlaw.	New developments are built to higher efficiency standards, and designed to a higher quality than previously therefore it is expected that new development will be better placed to mitigate the effects of climate change. Any new development in heritage areas will be assessed to ensure that there are no adverse impacts upon those assets.
DBLP400	989956	Nottinghamshire County Council - Highways	There are no specific transport related objectives cited in the tables that immediately follow each of the draft Local Plan policy objectives. Specific and targeted transport objectives are recommended and should be included in the tables for Policy 1, Policy 2, Policy 9, Policy 10 and Policy 11. It would be useful for example to have at least a transport related objective that supports and promote the use of public transport, cycling and walking in each policy table.	Objective 10 covers investment in transport infrastructure and this is referenced after Policies 1, 9, 10 and 11. However, it is accepted that the Local Plan would benefit from transport objective, rather than one which relates to investment in transport infrastructure.
DBLP443	990800		Support the overall strategy which will seek to deliver the Council's Vision of making Bassetlaw a place where rural and urban life prosper from investment and growth. Support Strategic Objective 4 which seeks to facilitate development opportunities that will enhance Bassetlaw's economy through the delivery of new and the expansion of existing enterprises, providing jobs across urban and rural Bassetlaw and Strategic Objective 6 which seeks to promote rural Bassetlaw as a living and working landscape, where new development responds to local needs and opportunities, and protects the intrinsic character of the countryside.	Support for Objectives 4 and 6 is welcome.
DBLP524	991184		The loss of aviation-dependent businesses and development both contradicts and ignores two of the supposed Visions & Objectives namely:- a. 4. and 6. Therefore, the plan's proposals are the opposite of what is prescribed in paragraphs 4. and 6. in that closing Retford Gamston Airport removes, rather than expands, existing enterprises and fails to protect the intrinsic character of the countryside given that the airfield has been an integral part of that since 1942.	It is acknowledged that should Retford Gamston Airport close some aviation businesses may have to relocate out of the District. However, the proposal also includes the provision of employment development. Objective 6 is designed to relate to rural employment such as farm diversification. This point could be clearer.
Policy 1: Spatial Strategy				
DBLP2	Miss S Gaskell		Supports the overall spatial strategy	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP16	Mr T Bray		Support the overall strategy for Bassetlaw. People need affordable housing which is close to essential services - doctors, pharmacy, travel links, shops, schools etc. But suitable housing also needed for elderly and for disabled. Sited away from noise but in a pleasant 'landscaped' and possibly sheltered accommodation area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP24	F Ieromino		Supports the overall spatial strategy	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP31	Clir J Ogle		The country to the NE and S of Bassetlaw is rural in character and not heavily populated, this landscape is attractive. This should be accepted as positive. The attractive nature of the open agricultural cropping and more heavily wooded areas and historic legacy assets recommends itself to international and national tourism as well as the local interests of the nearby urban populations. These rural areas are less attractive for leisure pursuits. People travelling to Bassetlaw for these reasons do not wish to pass a massive New Town on the edge of the Dukeries. There must be an economic cost to tourism and leisure if this course is taken. These areas are positive for agriculture where residential fringe is an impediment to efficient agriculture. No attempt has been made to consider the agricultural quality or production capacity of the land. It may not be a national requirement but would have been appropriate as there is much good agricultural land which would be advantageously conserved from development. The country imports much of the crops which can be grown in the District and this country and is a strategic asset. Recent planning permissions in East Markham have been granted on Grade 2 agricultural land - Grade 2 is better quality than Grade 3.	Agricultural land quality of potential sites is considered through the Sustainability Appraisal. The impact of the loss of Grade 1, 2 and 3 agricultural land is recognised through Objective 1 and Policy 27 Green Infrastructure.
DBLP31	Clir J Ogle		Benefits of economic growth through population growth are imagined in the Plan. An increasing population does not necessarily lead to economic growth but there are definite demands on the services such as health care, education, public transport, leisure which can result in more of a liability than an economic investment. For instance, Italy has a modern economy with an educated population which has grown over the last 20 years, but economic growth has not grown but stayed static. This may be to do with an ageing population. A younger population is associated in classical economics with economic growth and capital formation.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP31	Clir J Ogle		The Plan expects an ageing population which will create a strain on services. Increasing numbers of old people in hard to get area will increase demand in health care and emergency facilities. It will be difficult to meet these needs. It would be better to provide residential for the ageing population near a health centre and A&E in Retford or Worksope close to Bassetlaw hospital where health care is available in their own houses. The younger generation in general wish to work in cities. The most successful will wish to be located near to their work and to a good public transport link to give easy access to cities of the North and more quality time with their families. The older growing population is unlikely to be economically dynamic. While older people are part of the economy the strategy envisaged is unlikely to fire up economic growth. Residential urbanisation may restrict growth and see a reduction in quality of life for existing residents.	Yes- this matter will be addressed in policy 19 of LP.
DBLP31	Clir J Ogle		Proposed developments are new residential towns, urban extensions as identified by BDC. Not villages. Are many garden villages in Bassetlaw, most could be described as such. The proposed sprawling estates, played down in the Plan, do not come into the garden village category. The garden village concept glosses over the residential urbanisation of a rural, attractive area. ALTERNATIVE: The 2 sites should be used for industrial commercial as the sites are brown land. Clear access onto the A1 is a unique asset for this part of Bassetlaw for heavy goods and large load access with no residential for the heavy traffic to pass through. Benefits for Tuxford: large loads from the present industrial commercial area have to travel through the centre to access the A1. A low bridge at Boughton prevents these loads from accessing Ollerton and the A614. Tuxford is the only access. Residents are now suffering environmental and congestion penalties. This is an opportunity to encourage relocation of business to Bevercotes and Gamston Airfield and allow residential development on the industrial estate, with smaller traffic being more suitable for the centre of Tuxford than the juggernauts. This would make the centre of Tuxford safer and revitalise it, provide economic and environmental benefits, cut diesel pollution. Conclusion: The draft proposal of so called garden villages (New Town should be classed as urban extension) will drastically reduce accessibility within this area of the district. Leaving Gamston Airfield as brown land and the colliery which has planning permission for a distribution centre to provide jobs would enable Retford, Tuxford, East and South East Bassetlaw and Worksope to access jobs without a long commute. Jobs are required especially as Cottam Power Station has closed (loss of 300 jobs) and West Burton Power Station will close shortly. Residential provides 6 car movements a day per house. "Garden Villages" would create serious congestion into Retford. Industrial and commercial on those sites will produce many times less small traffic. Large heavy traffic would be straight onto the A1. The concrete products manufacturer in Tuxford makes the longest concrete beams in the country for motorways, etc. Their competitors are national - Eire and Europe. Have difficulty getting their products through Tuxford, there is no alternative. Use extra long transport but must mount pavements and use both sides of the road to get past the central Tuxford junction. Were considering moving and a supported move to Gamston Airfield would improve the situation all round.	The garden village concept will create a mixed community which comprises of housing, employment and local services. This will create a sustainable settlement that addresses inclusivity and address localised needs.
DBLP31	Clir J Ogle		Does not support the overall spatial strategy	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP32	H Bennett		Supports the overall spatial strategy	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP81	J Pope	GPS Planning and Design Ltd	As Bassetlaw is predominantly a rural District, support the positive distribution of growth spatial strategy approach to rural development advocated in the Local Plan. This seeks to deliver a minimum of 1777 dwellings over the Plan period with encouragement given to Neighbourhood Planning Groups to allocate sites to meet their housing requirement.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP90	M Grant	Lichfields on behalf of db symmetry Ltd	In the absence of a specific area strategy for Blyth parish, the site could potentially be considered part of either Harworth & Bircotes or Rural Bassetlaw. Whilst we have made some assumptions this needs to be clarified in the next iteration of the DBLP. This is particularly important given that the strategy for Rural Bassetlaw largely looks towards encouraging individual Parish Council's to prepare Neighbourhood Plans to guide development at parish level. It is imperative that the DBLP establishes Symmetry Park as one of the district's key strategic employment sites and does not open the door for piecemeal interpretations of its status to be made within forthcoming Neighbourhood Plans. Do not believe it was the Councils intention to exclude Symmetry Park, but DBLP fails to acknowledge it meaning the site remains in a policy vacuum. This could be addressed by the inclusion of references to the site in the text, minor adjustment of language used in respect of the proposed sites, and the minor adjustment of the key diagram. Object to the current DBLP and believe it fails to meet the tests of soundness set out in the NPPF. a is not positively prepared in that it fails to have regard to a major development that benefits from planning permission and will contribute towards meeting identified needs. b Cannot be justified in that the DBLP disregards the evidence base which clearly identifies Symmetry Park as a significant employment site. c is not effective in that it is unclear and fails to provide a strategic framework for neighbourhood and other development plan / local plan documents. d is not consistent with National Policy in that it does not clearly define the overall strategy for the "pattern, scale and quality of development" - it does not clearly define the development on this site in the parish of Blyth. Nor does the DBLP identify "broad locations for development" or indicate these accurately on a "key diagram". The DBLP thus fails to provide a clear strategy on how it will bring sufficient land forward for employment development.	Acknowledge that the Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure economic growth can take place in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment will provide a clearer vision and plan for employment growth including for Symmetry Park.
DBLP110	K Crisp	Cushman & Wakefield on behalf of Stancliffe Homes	Policy 1 sets out the Spatial Strategy for the distribution of housing and employment growth across the district. These are set out in 5 spatial strands. These strands/strategies set their own growth targets as part of the overarching target for growth. For Rural Bassetlaw the strategy identifies that their future growth will be delivered by a combination of neighbourhood plan housing land allocations and a strategy to support appropriate market-led applications, in and adjoining rural settlements up to an identified cap. The purpose of the cap is to allow opportunity-based future development not allocated to be approved where they are of a scale appropriate to the existing settlement. Support the principle of the policy to distribute development which contributes to an overall sustainable pattern of growth to ensure the needs of the local communities within Bassetlaw are met. However, object to the allocation of Shireoaks and Rhodesia as Rural Bassetlaw. There is no justification within the 2018 Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study (2018) as to why Shireoaks and Rhodesia have been excluded from Workstop as a location for growth. Within the Core Strategy Policy CS1 includes both Shireoaks and Rhodesia as part of the 'Principal Urban Area' of Workstop. Where the focus of major housing, employment and town centre retail growth would be directed. It is unclear from the evidence why these have now been excluded from the Principal Urban Area of Workstop and identified as Rural Settlements, where growth will be capped. It is also unclear what the reasoning is for the 20% cap rate. Each application should be determined on its own merits and future growth of settlements should not be resisted where the 20% cap has been reached. The level of development for each settlement should be regularly reviewed as development comes forward. The policy fails to identify any broad locations of growth or set out a mechanism by which new sites will be allocated for development as part of the next stage of the Local Plan process. Policy 1 as worded is unjustified and unsound. It should be reworded and Figure 3: Key Diagram should be amended to include Shireoaks and Rhodesia within the Workstop area: "...New development within and adjoining the largest town in Bassetlaw including Shireoaks and Rhodesia along with supporting town centre focused investment and regeneration to support Workstop's role as the main employment, infrastructure and service centre for the District. Economic investment and residential growth in Workstop will also support and benefit from the town's strong sub-regional links to South Yorkshire and widely connected through excellent proximity to both the A57, A1 and east-west rail links. This growth will significantly contribute to the delivery of new housing and economic development (inter alia).	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Shireoaks and Rhodesia are parishes in their own right and this needs to be acknowledged in planning for their future growth. Each Rural Settlement as listed in Policy 8 has a 20% cap. The Council considers this is a fair and equitable approach as it enables communities to plan for their own development needs through a NP.
DBLP115	M Eagland	Peacock & Smith on behalf of Gleeson Regeneration Ltd	Concerned that the equitable distribution of growth strategy fails to recognize the role and function of Workstop as the largest settlement within the District with the greatest range of shops and services and employment opportunities. The spatial strategy would lead to a disproportionate amount of housing growth located in rural settlements and garden villages, leading to greater travel by the private car, and therefore giving rise to an unsustainable pattern of development. The 2011 Core Strategy identifies Workstop as the District's primary town and the main retail and employment centre for the District. EDNA states: "Workstop market has a high level of services and good transport infrastructure. The area is the key work destination concentrating 38% of the total employment of the District (over 19,000 jobs). Half of all the office services across the district are concentrated in Workstop. Workstop dominates economically and it constitutes the key employment hub, particularly for the west parts of the District." Surprised and disappointed that only 24% of the District's housing requirement is directed to Workstop, which represents an 8% drop from the share set out in the Core Strategy. This significantly reduced share of housing growth for the District's primary settlement would not support sustainable development, and it has not been adequately justified. The housing requirement for Workstop should be increased to reflect its status as the largest settlement within the District with the greatest range of shops and services and employment opportunities. An appropriate share would be that level set out in the Core Strategy.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.
DBLP127	C Robinson	TwelveTwentyOne Planning Services on behalf of Hamlin Estates	Support the strategy. The overall policy is laudable though the reliance, albeit limited, on two new villages is debatable. New villages inevitably prove contentious and, if approved, will require substantial infrastructure and other establishment costs. This can prove a deterrent to delivery - an issue that will likely prove to be intractable for two new settlements so close to one another where they will predate upon the same housing market. The general strategy set out in Policy 1 is supported, particularly the on-going role of the rural centres. These rural centres should continue to make an important contribution to housing delivery. Development across these settlements is sustainable as it makes full and efficient use of existing public and social infrastructure and also helps to sustain local services. It is also considered that any Neighbourhood Plans should not be restrictive but should, instead, seek to provide policies that facilitate housing delivery.	Thank you for your comments which are noted nad the approach taken with Policy 8. Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the NPPF and the BLP.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Agree in principle with the proposed 'alternative hybrid' approach to development across the District which is reflected in the Council's 'Spatial Strategy Options' document. Agree that it is not necessarily the case that growth must be allocated proportionally in line with a rigid settlement hierarchy. Agree that the availability of suitable sites is also an important factor in determining the levels of growth that are apportioned to settlements. Significant concerns with how the approach has led to growth being proportioned across the District. Concerns that the development needs of the District have been underestimated for the Plan and the subsequent development requirements have subsequently been understated. Consider that there is no one single focused special strategy which would a) be sufficient to meet the needs of the District and; b) result in sustainable development across the District's settlement (both higher and lower order settlements). It is not clear from the Local Plan or its evidence base how the final apportionment of development across the District has been arrived at. It is simply stated within Figure 3 of the plan with a percentage distribution across the settlements within the District. Whilst it is not necessary to stick rigidly to a settlement hierarchy, it is necessary to take an evidence based approach to distributing development based in the needs of those settlements.	Thank you for your comments which are noted, the Spatial Strategy is based around the principle that rural settlements should grow sustainably and this could be achieved through the production of NPs. Functional cluster approach was tested and was found to not be viable. Officers have worked with NP groups and gained better understanding about issues facing rural issues and discovered an appetite for growth in more rural areas than what the functional clusters were enabling. Also refer to the Rural Settlement Study.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Support the broad model for the distribution of development across the District in the 'Spatial Strategy Options' document Option 1 as it represents an accurate settlement hierarchy. SSO 1 is reflective of the established settlement hierarchy across the District as proposed in the Council's previous Core Strategy and consistent with the need to maintain and enhance the vitality of the main settlements within the District. The proposed distribution of housing development is not reflective of the overall settlement hierarchy and consider that adjustments should be made in relation to the overall distribution of development to more closely align (which can be made as part of the process for SSO 2 which is supported); in particular to Retford and Harworth. The allocation of 27% of development to the rural areas and local service centres without any proposed allocation of employment land or any specific measures to enhance their sustainability is considered to be unjustified.	EDNA study indicates that a large percentage of employment is in rural areas and therefore suitable housing provisions should be in rural areas. Policy in the LP is supportive of employment in sustainable rural locations where there is a justified need for it.

DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Disagree with 15% of the District's proposed housing being allocated to the new garden villages. The District already comprises a largely rural borough with a significant number of villages, particularly within the east of the borough. Do not support the creation of two new villages, particularly when the Council is already seeking to locate some 18% of its housing distribution to the rural area to support the sustainability of rural areas. Retford, as a rural hub for the centre and east of the District, and an area for employment growth is ideally placed to meet the bulk of the housing needs in the rural part of the District; subject to the plan identifying and meeting specific needs of the rural and local service centres. Object to Retford being allocated only 13% of the overall housing requirement for the District; less than any other town or the rural area. The continued growth of Retford is vital for the health of the rural areas and for the District in meeting its wider development needs. Housing growth in the District is going to need to undergo a significant step change upwards which will require the development of areas which are able to sustain higher levels of housing growth. Retford is a sustainable and attractive location for housing development and its continued growth is considered to somewhat underpin the success of the housing market within the District. The AMR 2017/18 sets out the level of housing completions in the District between 2006/7 to 2017/18. Of the 2,619 net completions over that period, 1,321 completions were in Retford which comprises over half of the completions within the District's towns. The monitoring data demonstrates that the Local Plan dramatically underestimates the role of Retford in the housing market. Retford, as the District's second largest town has been allocated the least amount of housing development of the three main settlements. This is despite Retford having suitable sites for development and market signals point a proven track record of delivering housing where other settlements within the District have been less successful. Consider that the delivery of a sustainable urban extension on land to the south of Ordsall will help deliver the required level of growth at Retford and should be allocated accordingly. The Council's economic aspirations should be increased and the District should more closely align itself with the SCR to benefit from the level of growth planned regionally. There is an argument for increasing the proportion of employment development (and subsequently housing development) which is envisaged within Harworth. It is disappointing that the Plan no longer seeks specifically to deliver a 'Step Change' in employment growth at Harworth, which was the strong aspiration of the Core Strategy and the 'Initial Draft'. Consider that the circumstances to deliver that step change (including planning permission for land to the south of Harworth 84ha of employment land) exist and this should be reflected in the new Local Plan going forwards.	The Council's overall strategic approach recognises the roles of Worksoop and Retford in its settlement hierarchy, but also recognises that there are constraints to delivering significant development in both towns. Therefore, the Council is looking to deliver a new settlement which is equidistant between Worksoop and Retford. This, along with some limited growth in rural villages, will address some of the development needs of both towns later in the plan period, whilst supporting the improved connectivity between the towns and the wider region including the new adjacent strategic employment site. The need for economic land reflects the findings of the EDNA and the housing supply supports that. The LP will allocate employment land in the most sustainable locations that are attractive to the market. Site allocations will be considered in the next version of the local plan.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Para 2.6 of 'Spatial Strategy Options' (SSO) is potentially unclear in considering the Council's future approach to Harworth considering its future role in the context of pipeline development proposals. For clarity, where development proposals are not started but considered likely to come forward through the plan period they should be allocated within the Local Plan. For the avoidance of doubt the proposed development of 84ha of employment land at 'Land to the South of Harworth should be allocated within the Local Plan and be considered as an existing commitment for the purposes of forward planning.	The Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure economic growth can take place in the District in future. The EDNA identifies the employment land needs at a District level, and includes provision for the A1 Growth Corridor which does not readily sit with an employment land target for any of the three main towns. On that basis the new Local Plan identifies an employment land need for the District by identifying new employment sites of importance for the general and strategic employment market. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment will provide a clearer plan for employment growth including site allocations.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Support SSO Option 2 as a sustainable approach to the distribution of development. A sustainable approach to planning for the rural area and its settlements is to establish the development needs of those villages and apportion an appropriate level of development where those needs arise. Do not support the level of growth apportioned to the villages and rural area currently which is in excess of what is required to support the Council's rural area. More appropriate to allocate the 1,000 homes proposed for new villages to be allocated to the existing villages within the rural areas. Worksoop and Retford should be the main focus of housing development within the District. Those Strategic Options should make clear that the vital role that Retford will have in meeting the housing needs of the District as well as the role of new housing in supporting Harworth and Bircotes as a centre for regeneration and employment; those roles should not be underestimated.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Disappointed that the Council has pulled back from its commitment to allocate urban extensions to Worksoop and Retford within the previous Local Plan. The Local Plan should focus on the delivery of urban extensions as part of a hybrid approach to housing delivery. Those urban extensions should be allocated respective to their potential sustainability. The sustainability of an urban extension will be dependent on the context in which it is delivered; including, but not limited to, its environmental surroundings and constraints, access to facilities and location on and access to the strategic road network. Consider that the land to the south of Ordsall, Retford, is a logical and sustainable location for an urban extension and has historically represented a growth area for Retford.	The draft Local Plan does not contain site allocations - these are to be included in the next draft Local Plan.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Should be re-drafted to reflect amended 'Spatial Strategy Strands' that direct growth to the District's main settlements and omit the proposed development of Garden Villages. This includes: • Increased housing growth towards Retford; and • Significant reduction in the development directed towards the Rural Area. Support the policy's positive approach to supporting development proposals that comply with strategic allocations, site specific allocations or strategic or detailed policies governing the growth of settlements through market led windfall applications. The success of this policy will be in the detail of those other policies. Disagree with Spatial Strategy Strand 1 in relation to Rural Bassetlaw. It is vital that the vitality and viability of the rural area is maintained and some growth in those areas will be necessary. Object to the proposed allocation of development proportionate to the size of existing villages resulting in 27% of development being located to the rural area. The level of development to be delivered in the sustainable rural settlements should be based on a robust assessment of each of those settlements which establishes the level of appropriate development for each settlement; taking into account its development needs and constraints. Further work is required to establish the appropriate level of development in those locations. Supportive of the policy proposing new development within and adjoining Retford but the level of development should be dramatically increased in recognition of its fundamental role in maintaining the sustainability of the rural east of the District. Spatial Strategy Strand 4 for Harworth and Bircotes should be amended to a more aspirational approach for the town. Support the focussing of investment and new development to encourage regeneration of the town, the Plan should go further and seek to drive forward growth in Harworth and Bircotes as a centre for employment within the District. Emphasis should be put on its potential role as a regionally important settlement in terms of its economic contribution to the SCR and D2N2. Notwithstanding the extant permissions at Harworth (and pipeline development such as land south of Snape Lane) the need to deliver a 'step change' in the economic growth aspirations of Harworth should be stressed at Strategic Proposal 4 in line with the strategy set out within the Bassetlaw Core Strategy. Whilst significant progress has been made in term of the commitment of sites that 'step change' has not yet been delivered at Harworth and Bircotes and realising that 'step change' should remain a priority of the Plan. Spatial Strategy Strand 5 should be removed. Support a 'hybrid' approach but the Plan must focus housing and employment development on the three main settlements of Worksoop, Retford and Harworth; with an emphasis on employment development at Harworth. The distribution of that development should be managed through allocations by way of Sustainable Urban Extensions at the main tier settlements as well as a measures and proportional allocation of smaller development sites to the lower tier settlements to maintain and enhance their viability. In addition, the key role that Retford plays in maintaining the viability and vitality of the rural centre and east of the District as a service and transport hub for those areas should be recognised. The need to cater for the needs of the rural area as well as the resident population of Retford should be confirmed within the Local Plan.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Consider the Council has underestimated the level of uplift which it has sought to the minimum SMOAN figure to account for economic growth. The economic potential of the borough to grow given the economic opportunities that exist now and in line with the economic development of the SCR and D2N2 LEPS. The Council's EDNA suggests that the District will experience a 'modest' level of economic growth to 2035 - the industrial market in Bassetlaw demonstrates strength - The total stock is above average compared to other more rural authorities in the sub region and has shown 16% growth over the last 15 years, outperforming regional and county benchmarks. The EDNA comments that industrial activity in the district is currently focussed around Worksoop but that the AIM is considered an emerging or longer term market with commitments at Harworth subject to securing occupiers. The EDNA considers that an economic led housing need is identified in conjunction with the preferred scenario being of 390 dwellings per annum. Support an approach which seeks to increase housing land supply to take account of economic growth, the assessment does not go far enough. The EDNA is based on the District continuing to do what it has already started to do modestly well at economically and therefore the forecasts do not appear to reflect Bassetlaw's previous ambitions for a step-change in the District. Even if a modest level of growth was accepted as being the District's aspiration, it is not clear why the EDNA sought to support the Oxford Economic (OE) 'mid-point' forecast for growth within the borough. Table 16 of the EDNA sets out a number of growth scenarios and demonstrates that the OE baseline, midpoint and high growth scenarios are significantly lower than those provided by Cambridge Economics (CE) or Experian forecasts. The next lowest 'mid-point' growth scenario requires the provision of housing growth at 456dpa. The mean housing growth for the three forecasts for 'mid-point' growth scenarios is 446dpa (supporting 4766 jobs). As a minimum, this mean point should be the level of housing growth that should be provided to support economic growth in the District. The above forecasting fails to realise the potential of, and the Council's influence over, the District's opportunities to bring forward that step-change. Support the recognition that Harworth prevents an opportunity as an economic growth market as above. The scale of opportunity has been underestimated. The EDNA set out that over 1,000 hectares of assessed sites provide a spectrum of existing development, future commitments and potential further areas of development. The EDNA notes there are committed but (partially) undeveloped sites, including the site at Harworth, which are able to meet and exceed the projected needs of the district. The Council should be driving forward that change and encouraging the delivery of that employment land during the plan period. This will include the need to support that economic growth with a sufficient local labour force which will include a need for a significant uplift in housing provision. Capitalisation on the opportunities presented by the A1(M) and available development land at Harworth should be one of the key aims of the Council's economic strategy. The level of housing provided should be tailored around supporting a 'high growth' economic forecast which across the forecasts would provide between 6,500 and 8,700 jobs (7,533 jobs is the mean average of the 3 forecasts) which would require between 518dpa and 608dpa respectively (mean average of 560dpa across the 3 forecasts). An aspirational plan that sought to support the level of growth which could be achieved within Bassetlaw would provide for circa 560dpa or 10,080 dwellings across an 18 year plan period. Should the Council disagree that it is necessary to provide for a higher level of economic growth (and to stay with OE mid-point growth scenario of 390dpa), there are reasons why that figure should be increased.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. As required by the Housing Need PPG, the housing requirement/need will be kept under review as the Plan progresses.

DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	The baseline projections for household projections (which have been used to derive economic led household forecasts) are based on 2016-based subnational population projections (SNPP) from 2018 to 2035. The baseline for the projections is started below that of the SMOAN against which the forecasts are considering an uplift. For the EDNA to robustly consider the extent to which economic growth should be factored into any increase in housing needs, the baseline for the demographic needs and economic growth should utilise the same projections. Chapter 7 'key points' refers to the SHMA as being the most up to date evidence on housing need - suggests a need of 435 dwellings per annum to meet Bassetlaw's Objectively Assessed Need (OAN). It states it may be necessary to allocate sites for more dwellings than the residual housing requirement to reflect that larger sites may deliver beyond the plan period. Para 6.9 considers whether a higher rate of housing delivery might be indicative of a level of housing need above the SMOAN. Agree that delivery of housing between 2010-2018 averages 329dpa which would not indicate a need to deliver above 390dpa. The last two years of delivery, with market conditions more broadly reflecting the conditions seen within Bassetlaw today, delivery has exceeded 500dpa. This indicates that the housing market has a need for in excess of 390dpa. Note the continuing trend of the Council's evidence base to underestimate housing growth needs. The OAN identified previously was between 435 - 500dpa. Since then, the 2017 SHMA recommends a housing requirement of 374dpa or, if a more ambitious plan is chosen, a level of housing growth at 417dpa. It is indicative that as market conditions for economic growth improve within the District, and delivery rises, the evidence base is demonstrating a concerning trend downwards for the level of housing it considers needs to be delivered. Significant concerns that underestimating the supply of housing needed over the plan period could constrain economic growth below the potential that the Council has helped to cultivate.	The Council is satisfied that the EDNA study is robust and it provides sufficient evidence to justify the approach taken to the annual housing requirement as proposed in the LP.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	There is a case for the level of housing provision to be further increased to account for the need to provide affordable housing within the District. The PPG notes that the SMOAN makes an 'affordability adjustment' to ensure that the standard method for assessing local housing need responds to price signals and is consistent with the policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. This specific adjustment in this guidance is made in response to the 'affordability' of housing. The adjustment is made only to ensure that housing provision is set at a level to ensure that the minimum housing need "starts to address the affordability of homes ". As a minimum, this policy requirement is only that it does not make the affordability of homes worse. The above makes no requirement on the solving of affordable housing shortfalls within Districts. The SHMA identifies affordable housing needs for the District separately; which the SMOAN does not. That affordable housing need is 134dpa for affordable homes between 2014-2035. Para 7.5 shows that, taking into account under delivery, that there is a residual requirement for 2,719 affordable homes to be delivered within the plan period (or 39% of the proposed housing requirement). The Plan suggests that the affordable housing needs will not be met due to viability issues. Whilst the ability of the open market to deliver affordable housing is an issue which must be addressed, including allocation of Sites in more buoyant market areas, the main contributing factor to the lack of affordable housing that can be delivered is the lack of housing proposed overall. Not provided a breakdown of what the maximum number of affordable units the proposed supply could deliver. From a review of the annual monitoring data available it is clear that the delivery of affordable housing is likely to fall significantly below the 134dpa required through the plan period. From 2014-2018 the Council only delivered 95 affordable dwellings. In 2016/17, it delivered 459 dwellings and 67 of those were affordable; circa 15%. If the above rate of delivery of affordable homes was maintained, the District would need to deliver some 893dpa to deliver the level of affordable housing it needs. In light of increasing difficulties facing the District with regard to the affordability, it is considered that an additional uplift should be applied to the Council's housing requirement to boost the supply of housing to help meet affordable housing needs.	The Council is satisfied that the EDNA study is robust and it provides sufficient evidence to justify the approach taken to the annual housing requirement as proposed in the LP.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	If the economic aspirations are curtailed from previous drafts of the Local Plan to only a 'mid-point' growth scenario, that a mean average of forecast job growth would require 446dpa or 8,028 dwellings over an 18-year plan period. But the level of housing should be tailored around supporting a 'high growth' economic forecast which across the forecasts would provide between 6,500 and 8,700 jobs. That growth should be supported by at least 560dpa or 10,080 dwellings across an 18 year plan period. Housing growth should be maximised to help meet the affordable housing shortfall as far as sustainably possible. At this stage, the Local Plan is seeking to set a housing requirement figure which would require the delivery of affordable housing at a rate of 40% of its open market units, or circa three times what it has previously achieved in its most successful year (15%).	The Council is satisfied that the EDNA study is robust and it provides sufficient evidence to justify the approach taken to the annual housing requirement as proposed in the LP.
DBLP138	I Carter	Bothamsall Parish Council	Does not support the spatial strategy: Bothamsall Parish Council are broadly in favour of allowing a small number of carefully controlled new dwellings but the total maximum number of 15 is too high. Any new housing in Bothamsall village will first require replacement of key services, in particular the already failing sewage transfer equipment/system. Support the development of Bevercotes Colliery site subject to significant improvements and limitation of through traffic passing through Bothamsall village, but do not support the loss of existing employment and redevelopment of Gamston Airport.	The figure given is not a requirement The approach taken enables a small amount of development to occur where there is sufficient infrastructure to support it in the rural areas over the plan period (up to 2037). The community of Bothamsall has the opportunity to plan for this growth through the development of the NP.
DBLP143	George Breed	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	A hybrid approach to the distribution of development is drawn out from the Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2016). Note a subsequent revision (Jan 2019) has now also been published. The 2019 SA identifies the Council's preferred 'parallel strategy' differs from the 2016 interim SA 'hybrid strategy' referred to within the draft local plan. The new 'parallel strategy' incorporates the 'hybrid strategy' which looks to pursue a combination of the following with the addition of an equitable distribution of growth: 1. Maintain extant local plan approach 2. New Hierarchy based on functional geography 3. Focus development along A1 corridor 4. New or expanded rural settlements 5. Large scale urban extensions. It is acknowledged a pluralistic spatial approach maximises the available site allocation choices the resultant spatial policy lacks clarity. On review of Table 4.2 the adjudication procedures lacks precision, appear to be based upon broad assumptions with little weight given to acknowledged unknown factors which should by default be deemed risks until proven otherwise. The Local Plan espouses a 'hybrid approach' which does not reflect the latest 2019 SA which supports a 'parallel strategy'. Neither strategy appears to be fully evidenced raising questions over the appropriateness of the Local Plan spatial approach.	Thank you for your comment. The Council's overall strategic approach recognises the roles of Worksop and Retford in its settlement hierarchy, but also recognises that there are constraints to delivering significant development in both towns. Therefore, the Council is looking to deliver a new settlement which is equidistance between Worksop and Retford. This, along with some limited growth in rural villages, will address some of the development needs of both towns later in the plan period, whilst supporting the improved connectivity between the towns and the wider region including the new adjacent strategic employment site. The need for economic land reflects the findings of the EDNA and the housing supply supports that. The LP will allocate employment land in the most sustainable locations that are attractive to the market. Site allocations will be considered in the next version of the local plan.
DBLP147	R Irving	ID Planning on behalf of The Haworth Group	The Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy is encapsulated in 5 spatial strategy strands. These relate to rural Bassetlaw, Worksop: sub-regional centre, Retford: rural hub town, Harworth and Bircotes: local regeneration centre and new garden villages. It is clear the spatial strategy in relation to Harworth and Bircotes seeks to focus investment and new developments to support the continued regeneration of the third largest town in Bassetlaw. The strategy wants to strengthen its role as a local infrastructure and service centre to the north east district. Support the fact the strategy states development will be supported where it can benefit for Harworth and Bircotes excellent connections to South Yorkshire and access to the A1. The planning application for land off Scrooby Road and North of Snape Lane, Harworth wholly mirrors the aims and aspirations of Policy 1 in respect of how it impacts on Harworth and Bircotes.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP148	R Flounders	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	Retford is identified as a rural-hub town. The policy states that new development will be supported in and adjoining this town, which is the second largest in Bassetlaw. Support this spatial strategy strand in relation to Retford. Policy 1 also identifies a spatial strategy strand for two new garden villages. It is stated that these villages will establish a sustainable community delivering a large number of homes over the next 30 years. Do not object to the identification of garden villages in principle. There is a separate spatial strand for Rural Bassetlaw which seeks to support proportionate growth to support over 60 villages and hamlets across the District. It should be acknowledged that the new garden villages will form part of Rural Bassetlaw when they are delivered.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.
DBLP149	H Godley	Fisher German on behalf of D Thorlby	The Spatial Strategy proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District's development needs is generally supported. The proposed role of Worksop as a 'Sub-regional Centre' is logical and reflects the town's spatial role and sustainability credentials. The approach of directing new development to within and adjoining the town is supported. The delivery of housing on the edge of Worksop is considered to meet the requirements of the NPPF para 59 which states that "To support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed". There is a clear demand for housing in Worksop and therefore it is imperative that the Council are proactive in planning for further housing to come forward. Whilst the approach proposed in respect of Worksop is supported, object to the proposed New Garden Villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.
DBLP156	L Stephens	Sheffield City Council	Note this paragraph on addressing the Duty to Cooperate. Confirm that at the time of writing, there have been no requests for Bassetlaw to address the development needs of neighbouring local authorities. Sheffield wrote to all authorities within Sheffield City Region in April 2018 to formally ask whether there was any scope to meet Sheffield's needs. At that time, Bassetlaw responded that until conclusions are made on evidence for the emerging Local Plan Bassetlaw cannot commit to providing land to meet shortfalls elsewhere. For clarity this dialogue should be reflected in the Plan or supporting evidence on the Duty to Cooperate. Also note that there is sufficient land identified within the Draft Plan for meeting housing needs. On this basis, assume that Sheffield is not required to meet any of Bassetlaw's housing needs.	Whilst it is acknowledged that Sheffield CC wrote to Bassetlaw DC to scope out the potential for delivering some of their needs, it was not a formal request to Bassetlaw to ask them to meet their needs. Bassetlaw will continue to work with Sheffield CC as the Plan progresses to address the requirements of the duty to cooperate. This will be clarified in the next iteration of the draft Bassetlaw Plan.

DBLP153	J Neville	The Haworth Group on behalf of Welbeck Colliery	Supportive of the overall strategy for Bassetlaw but feel that an opportunity has been missed in identifying the former Welbeck Colliery site for a mixed-use development especially when considering the need for investment in rural communities.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will consider this suggestion as part of the ongoing development of the Plan.
DBLP158	H Godley	Fisher German on behalf of T Strawson and D Horrocks	The Spatial Strategy which proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District's development needs is generally supported. The proposed role of Retford, as a 'rural-hub town' is commensurate with both the towns spatial role and sustainability credentials. Retford benefits from a significant service provision and excellent transport connections and is considered sound for the town to be earmarked for growth. The approach of directing new development to and adjoining the town is supported. The delivery of housing on the edge of Retford is considered to meet the requirements of the NPPF para 59 which states that "To support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed". There is a clear demand for housing in Retford and it is imperative that the Council are proactive in planning for further housing to come forward. The approach in respect of Retford is generally supported, we object to the proposed New Garden Villages and the reduction in dwelling numbers assigned to Retford.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.
DBLP169	J Herring	Avant Homes (Central) and Wyndthorpe Developments Ltd	Sets the overarching spatial strategy across the District through the identified plan period (2018 to 2035). Within the spatial strategy, the town of Retford is identified as a 'rural-hub town', second only to Worksop in terms of its scale and focus for investment & infrastructure. This is welcomed and consistent with the current settlement hierarchy found in Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy. The pre-amble text to the policy makes clear that over the plan period additional permissions may be granted where amongst brownfield & regeneration opportunities, there is an identified shortfall in supply that would engage the tilted balance found in NPPF para 11 d). Consider the policy should make clear that this may include sustainable development outside of the defined settlement limits, where proposals would generally accord with the Development Plan as a whole. Note that the Council has yet to prepare monitoring indicators, to support the delivery of the plan. Given the complexities associated with the delivery of new isolated settlements, including the delivery of upfront infrastructure and associated viability issues, consider it prudent to commit to an early review of the plan should sites fail to deliver as anticipated, particularly the new villages. This would include a review alongside the housing trajectory supporting the plan, with a commitment to identifying further land for development should there be any slippage across sites in order to ensure that the minimum planned housing requirement is met as required by the NPPF. Consider a contingency against the plan requirement of 6,630 dwellings to ensure there is a sufficient land supply in order to provide a realistic prospect that the plan target will be met. From experience of participating in Local Plan examinations, recommend a minimum of 20% in order to reduce the margin for failure, consistent with those recommendations put forward by the Local Plans Expert Group and the Home Builders Federation. This is important given that the Council is seeking to rely upon the delivery of circa 1,000 units inside the plan period from two new strategic settlements. The above point is persuasive given the Council's evidence on lapse rates since the start of the plan period. Para 6.17 states lapse rates for sites of 5 or more dwellings have equated to around 25% since 2010. Whilst the application of the average lapse rate to those committed sites yet to commence construction is justified and welcomed, the evidence casts doubt on the deliverability of the residual requirement moving forward unless a sufficient contingency is factored in to the plan requirement.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.
DBLP170	M Malcolm	East Markham Parish Council	Note you have abandoned the cluster model. The new plan is a fairer way to distribute housing growth in rural Bassetlaw. Could look again at the villages where growth is not supported, to ascertain if their conclusions are fully valid.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP173	J Cox	Lichfields on behalf of SP Scholey and the estate of WA Scholey	Support the overarching principles of the Spatial Strategy, consider that Policy 1 (or Policy 8) should go further in identifying which of the 60+ villages and hamlets located in Rural Bassetlaw are considered to be most suitable to accommodate new development. Note that the Initial Draft Local Plan provided much more detail on this and acknowledged, for example, that Ranskill – as a 'Defined Rural Settlement within a Functional Cluster' – was considered to be one of the district's 'sustainable rural settlements', reflecting the availability of facilities and services in the locality of the village. Consider the "blanket" 10% distribution of new housing across individual settlements in Rural Bassetlaw (and the arbitrary 20% growth cap) to be too simplistic an approach and would prevent larger scale housing scheme being brought forward in locations where they could otherwise achieve a more sustainable form of development. This would limit the extent to which any affordable housing, community infrastructure, facilities and services can be delivered (and contrary to the associated policies in the draft Local Plan that seek to achieve these benefits). This approach is contrary to the test of soundness in the NPPF and the Spatial Strategy should be revised accordingly. The inclusion of two garden villages is noted as forming part of the proposed Spatial Strategy. Whilst the delivery of large scale sites can be an appropriate solution to meeting demanding housing requirements (as advocated at NPPF para 72), a realistic approach needs to be taken with regards to their existing context and how this will affect their delivery. To this end, the complexities of landownership issues; masterplanning; lengthy lead-in times / build rates and; the proximity of the two sites (insofar as this potentially suppressing demand) all present potential risk and delay to the delivery of the garden villages during the Plan period. Refers to attached 'Start to Finish' paper produced by Lichfields as a guide for determining the likely lead-in times and delivery rates on large-scale housing sites. Welcome Policy 1's inclusion of windfall applications as being an important contributor of new housing in the district. Support the opportunity for new residential development to be granted where there is an identified shortfall in housing supply, emphasise the importance of allocating a sufficient supply of housing in the first place. It is important that such flexibility is engrained throughout the emerging Plan.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.
DBLP177	D Stephens	Linden Homes Strategic Land	Retford's role as a rural-hub is supported. Its important role does not appear to be reflected within the distribution of growth in the Key Diagram. This only allocates 13% of the housing growth for the District to Retford which conflicts with Para 5.6 that all settlements would grow by a consistent percentage (20%). It results in a noticeable reduction compared with the growth percentage in the adopted Core Strategy of 26%. The population of the town is approx 20% of Bassetlaw, and it is acknowledged in Para 10.7 that housing needs (including affordable housing needs) arising from the town over the Plan period will not be met in the town, but in the NGVs. Notwithstanding sustainable travel proposals outlined, the NGVs will not be as accessible to the communities from where the housing need arises, and this can create problems when seeking to meet affordable housing need in locations where those in need do not want to live due to the location. The NPPF requires that planning should actively manage patterns of growth to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport, and maximise the use of existing transport infrastructure. The town has excellent public transport links as acknowledged in para 10.3, and their use should be maximised and not limited at the expense of other less sustainable locations which may themselves have unacceptable impacts on transport infrastructure. The social and environmental effects of growth at Retford compared to the NGVs does not appear to have been fully considered within the Sustainability Appraisal. Whilst this is not an objection to the NGVs, the Plan will carefully need to consider the balance of growth between the settlements and ensure that the Plan does not have unintended consequences through limiting growth in Retford. Retford could, and should, be providing more towards the housing needs of the District than other less accessible locations.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.
DBLP183	R Millbank	Environment Agency	In line with the NPPF, priority should be given to sustainable developments and those on brownfield land rather than spreading into green belts and/or wedges. Appropriate recognition should be given to those brownfield sites which have the potential to be designated as Open Mosaic Habitat on previously developed Land (a UK priority habitat). Like the supporting text for this section to clearly state support for this hierarchy, if possible. Developments alongside existing transport links have the potential to enhance the network through appropriate greening. The "NEWP32 Transport green corridors" report looks at how the management of transport soft estate can be better integrated and linked with adjacent land management. This report was developed in line with Humberhead Levels Nature Improvement Area (NIA), so links in very nicely with the Plan. Would like to see the addition of the following wording, which would further enhance this already excellent section – either in the supporting text, or as an addition to the policy wording, which at first glance might sit best under the sub strand section '1. Rural Bassetlaw': 'In all cases, proposals which would result in unmitigated damage to habitats and wildlife will be refused. Proposals which require modification of a watercourse will not be supported, unless it can be proven that the modification will be of long-term benefit to the environment.'	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will review the policy wording and make any necessary amendments.
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	Support the inclusion of delivering net environmental gains in the New Garden Villages in Policy 1. Sites of Least Environmental Value: In accordance with the NPPF, para 171, the plan should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Expects sufficient evidence to be provided, through the SA and HRA, to justify the site selection process and to ensure sites of least environmental value are selected, e.g. land allocations should avoid designated sites and landscapes and significant areas of best and most versatile agricultural land and should consider the direct and indirect effects of development, including on land outside designated boundaries and within the setting of protected landscapes.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently developing a site selection methodology which will inform the selection of site allocations. This will take into consideration environmental constraints.
DBLP192	B Lomas	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	It is noted that the Plan moves away from setting out a rigid settlement hierarchy instead listing the individual strands of the spatial strategy. Do not object to this overall approach. It is considered that the plan has now not gone far enough in identifying development priorities. The Council should seek to deliver a plan which has a pro-development focus and seeks to encourage development to meet the economic and social aspirations. The policy is misleading, interpreted as focusing development priorities in Rural Bassetlaw. If it is the Council's intention that these strands should be seen as parallel to one another this should be made clearer. It is suggested that the spatial strategy is reformatted as follows: 1. Worksop: sub-regional centre 2. Harworth & Bircotes: local regeneration centre 3. Retford: rural-hub town 4. Rural Bassetlaw 5. New Garden Villages. For continuity the Plan should be restructured to follow the order listed. The above order better reflects the conclusions of the background documents regarding Spatial Strategy including the Sustainability Appraisal. It recognises the desire to focus growth on key areas playing specific roles within the district such as supporting economic and residential growth in Worksop the main employment, infrastructure and service centre for the district and a focused investment in the regeneration area of Harworth & Bircotes, reflecting the settlement's role as a local infrastructure and service centre in the northeast of the District. The strategy as amended will also ensure development opportunities across the District as a whole. The EDNA is clear in supporting growth options which enables uplift in the A1 corridor and in existing key settlements. Harworth is both a key settlement and located within the A1 corridor. The amendment will more accurately reflect the preferred Growth Options Assessment. Supportive of the continued recognition of Harworth & Bircotes as an identified Local Regeneration Centre in the District within the Spatial Strategy. The Council's evidence base is lacking in detail regarding the three main urban settlements of Worksop, Harworth & Bircotes and Retford. Whilst a Rural Settlement Study (2018) has been undertaken no detailed study of the three key urban areas has been undertaken to understand the continued need for growth. This is intrinsically linked to our comments in relation to Policy 2 and Policy 11.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will review the evidence for the Bassetlaw Plan to ensure that it fully explains the rationale behind the spatial strategy.
DBLP193	R Bowen	White Young Green on	The overall strategy, including the spatial distribution of housing for Bassetlaw is supported.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP194	H Leggett	Emery Planning on behalf of J G Pears Property Ltd	This Policy seeks to set out the Spatial Strategy for development in Bassetlaw over the Plan period. Support the reference within the Policy to the fact that: "over the plan period, additional permissions will be granted where it can be demonstrated that the benefits of the development will support the regeneration of the district and provide identifiable social, economic and environmental improvements above and beyond the current aims of this plan. This may include: • Unforeseen major redevelopment opportunities on largescale brownfield sites" This land interest should be allocated as an employment site and potentially for other uses, it is one site which would fall to be considered within the scope of this policy. Given the District's need to strive for greater employment opportunities, the significant number of now redundant major development sites in the District and, the need to achieve a reduction in out commuting, this policy is considered wholly appropriate. Assert that this support for redevelopment of major previously developed sites should be echoed through the first of the Spatial Strands set out for 'Rural Bassetlaw'. Specific reference should be made to the importance of sustainable economic investment /employment generating development and the support for existing employment sites in these areas in order to sustain a vibrant rural economy and make best use of land. The reuse of such sites for residential purposes, subject to the proposals achieving sustainable development in accord with the Framework, should also be incorporated and supported.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will review the wording of the Rural Bassetlaw Policy and make amendments where appropriate and necessary.
DBLP195	J Beverley	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of The Holy and Undivided Trinity	The Spatial Strategy which proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District's development needs are supported. The proposed role of Retford as a 'rural-hub town' reflects the towns role and sustainability credentials. Retford benefits from significant service provision and excellent transport connections and as such it is considered sound for the town to be identified for future economic and residential growth. Whilst the role of Retford is supported, have concerns with the limited dwelling numbers being directed to Retford as well as the proposed New Garden Villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP205	H Godley	Fisher German on behalf of P Hinds	The Spatial Strategy which proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District's development needs is supported. The identification of the villages of 'Rural Bassetlaw' as the location for proportionate growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development is supported. Allowing new development to come forward in villages is considered to be in line with NPPF para 78, which states that in order to promote sustainable development in rural areas, "housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby". New housing in Treswell will help to enhance and maintain the vitality of the existing community, support both the Village Hall in Treswell and the services in the nearby settlements of Rampton, Cottam, South Leverton and North Leverton with Hablethorpe. The services present within these villages include pubs, schools, convenience stores and a post office. There are a number of large employers in area, the Referendum Version Treswell and Cottam Neighbourhood Plan (paragraph 5.6, page 13) notes that "there are some significant local employers, including Rampton Hospital, Sundown Adventure Land and Cottam Power Station where employees are always seeking accommodation within the area". This is in addition to the smaller employers that are dispersed across the neighbouring settlements. New housing in Treswell could also assist in providing housing for people employed in the locality.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP207	M. Braithwaite	Robert Doughty Consultancy on behalf of J. Travis	Support the approach to growth in Rural Bassetlaw in Policy 1 which promotes the delivery of: "Proportionate growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development that will support the living, working and environmentally diverse landscape of the district, containing over 60 villages and hamlets located in a range of distinct landscapes, shaped by a legacy of agriculture, mining and historic Ducal estates." Rural communities require ongoing growth to ensure that they can continue to thrive and provide sustainable places to live and work.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP208	S Weston	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	Do not support "garden villages" in any form. Condemn the closing of established businesses for the sake of housing. I disagree with lining the pockets of shareholders in the major housing estate builders. I agree only with the freeing of useless or redundant greenfield and brownfield sites to allow anyone to build approved designs. I am disappointed that we as a nation have not learnt from our mistakes in the past with horrendous concrete monstrosities spread throughout otherwise beautiful towns, villages and cities. We still protect derelict wrecks with graded listings as they fall into disrepair and become unsafe while pretending to believe that we are doing the right thing by blotting the country with varying sized pockets of anonymous concrete and brick housing estates. Estates where we cram people from all levels of society and then show surprise when it becomes a melting pot for dysfunction. It is clear that Bassetlaw council have no wish for our period of history to remembered for anything other than filling up the land with a practical solution which pleases no one. We have handed over our architecture to those with limited imagination. We have handed over our trades to the lowest possible bidder. We have helped the greedy to control our businesses and our industry. We even gave them a "lowest mark" to aim for. I do not support this strategy.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP217	S Hayle	Axis ped on behalf of FCC Environment	Support the Council's proposed overall strategy which will seek to deliver the Council's Vision of making Bassetlaw a place where rural and urban life prosper from investment and growth. Consider the Draft Bassetlaw Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan actively seeks to support economic growth in accordance with the NPPF. This Plan sets out the Strategic Policies which will be supported by site allocations to deliver economic growth across the district. Support the identification of Rural Bassetlaw as one of the five Spatial Strategy Strands, this supports proportionate growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development that will support the living, working and environmentally diverse landscape. This also supports Strategic Objective 6 and is in accordance with the NPPF which confirms at Paragraph 83 that planning policies and decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP218	E Ridley	Pegasus Planing on behalf of E Fisher and Company Limited	The inclusion of Langold in the Settlement Hierarchy and as suitable for development is welcomed. The general approach to development within the 73 rural settlements is highly generalised, especially when considering 15/01605/OUT is capable of bringing forward a mixed use development. Acknowledged that the Council are due to assess each area based on its ability to accommodate this growth, it is considered that Langold would be a sustainable village that would be more suitable for growth than others, based on their size and existing service provision. The spatial strategy is unjustified as it does not provide an appropriate strategy for development outside of what could be considered to be the 'main' urbanised areas.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The spatial strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary.
DBLP219	C Jesson	Planning and Design Group on behalf of the Welbeck Estates Company Ltd	The general principle introduced that 'all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development by supporting some measure of development in settlements of all scales' is welcomed. This approach will help to unlock sustainable rural growth, including that delivered by appropriate land allocations and the open market. As such, rural Bassetlaw is identified as one 'strand' of interconnected settlement and land. This is as opposed to a top down, more traditional, spatial hierarchy of settlement and is summarised below in relation to development across rural Bassetlaw: 'Proportionate growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development that will support the living, working and environmentally diverse landscape of the district, containing over 60 villages and hamlets located in a range of distinct landscapes, shaped by a legacy of agriculture, mining and historic Ducal estates (p.31)'. Welcome the principle of a spatial hierarchy of settlements which is orientated around a positive approach to rural development. In particular the inclusion of Nether Langwith, Cuckney, Norton and Holbeck within the rural Bassetlaw strand of sustainable settlement is welcomed. Significant concerns are raised in relation to the proposed 20% cap to rural settlement growth and the apparent lack of differentiation made for the most sustainable rural settlements that may justify a higher cap.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP221	B Weedall	Gladman Developments	The emerging Local Plan covers the period 2018 – 2035. Approve of the plan period as this is consistent with the requirements of NPPF para 22 of the NPPF (2019) which makes clear that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period. The two garden villages supported by a range of small-medium sized development will ensure that the Local Plan responds positively to the long-term development requirements of Bassetlaw. Support the decision in progressing with a spatial strategy which seeks to deliver its full housing need through a range of delivery methods. Within this hybrid strategy, fully support the exploration into the delivery of new settlements supported by a range of smaller housing developments to meet the needs of local communities. New settlements can play an important role in the delivery of new housing to meet the needs of the district whilst avoiding some of the major constraints that may limit development elsewhere. Such development can bring positive support for struggling local services and can help bolster rural economies and infrastructure demands whilst providing a solution to the ever-increasing housing shortfall. The delivery of the New Settlements will help to reinforce and strengthen existing networks of the market towns and rural villages through their strategic location by providing new facilities to support existing and future residents. Approve of the flexibility provided by Policy 1 which allows for additional permissions to be granted where it can be demonstrated that the benefits of development will support the regeneration of the district by providing identifiable social, economic and environmental improvements. Should there be a shortfall in housing land supply this provides a prudent approach to support development proposals not identified through the local plan to come forward in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development and in line with the Plan's vision and objectives.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP229	S Ashton		Support the growth of new development in urban and rural areas. Hayton is one 73 sustainable villages which is suitable for new residential development. Rural settlements like Hayton will prosper and evolve through the delivery of planned and managed growth which will sustain and enhance local services and facilities.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP251	Mr & Mrs Wagstaff		Some of its proposals on future housing and employment are welcomed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP262	S Patience	Anglian Water	Note its proposed to identify additional housing and employment allocation sites as part of the next draft of the Local Plan. Anglian Water would wish to comment further on the implications of specific allocation sites for our existing water supply infrastructure once these have been identified.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to liaise with Anglian Water as the plan progresses, including identifying/assessing sites for allocation.
DBLP301	977042		Retford is not sustainable as it does not have adequate resources or infrastructure for current population. The roads and sewers are overloaded.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP303	978627		The fundamental need is to extend existing residential areas.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP308	986480		No support for the strategy.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP315	987680		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP317	987880		Support. I agree we need to build more houses, but they need to be in the right place.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP319	987959		No support for Gamston	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP326	988057		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP328	988061		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP336	988172		No support for the strategy. Throw the draft plan in the bin and leave things as they are.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP339	988184		No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		In a rural environment it cannot be the case that a flat rate 20% "fits all", large and small, particularly the very small settlements / parishes. In a village of say, 140 homes a growth of up to 25 will increase the population by 1/3rd but not allow the infrastructure and basic power, water, sewerage services to grow to satisfy that extra demand. This increase must be adjusted to that which is proportionate for that settlement.	The Council considers that an equitable approach is appropriate because development in one village has the potential to support services in another village (as identified in national policy - NPPF paragraph 78).

DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Support but with individual reservations as described above.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP363	988482		No support	
DBLP364	988487		Do not support the strategy	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP372	988501		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP373	988503		Support the need for more homes, but i do not support the location of Retford Gamston Airport as a site for a new village or any location which would impact on the Airport Operations.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP375	988527		No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP376	988557		Support. General concept is good. Devil is in the detail.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP384	988726		Broadly in agreement with proposed distribution of housing	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP391	988813		No support. Unacceptable to destroy a thriving airfield for use as housing.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP393	989007		No support. Firstly decide what you want Bassetlaw to look like 100 years from now and work towards that goal. Don't do knee jerk development because it is politically advantageous. Neighbourhood plans were developed over the past few years, discussed and agreed, and likewise the Bassetlaw Plan should follow the same route. Today was the first time I had heard about new villages etc. so to me it is obvious that wide spread communication has not happened	Thank you for your comments which are noted. This is a draft plan, not the final version of the plan. It is a consultation document to enable local residents to voice their views prior to the Council developing the plan further. This enables the Council to take on board views and make any necessary amendments.
DBLP394	989023		No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP398	989658		No support. Unconvinced of the need for so much housing within Bassetlaw when there are insufficient employment opportunities for existing residents. The consultation provided no reassurances. One of the "garden villages" will be built on the airfield which provides employment currently and this will go - makes no sense. There are a number of developments currently under construction in and around Retford how many more people can the infrastructure support? Who are the people needing these houses? Where are they currently?	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP399	989741		No support. The plan threatens Gamston Airport, a different site should be chosen	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP402	990030		Support. The overall policy is laudable though the reliance, albeit limited, on two new villages is debatable. New villages inevitably prove contentious and, if approved, will require substantial infrastructure and other establishment costs. This can prove a deterrent to delivery - an issue that will likely prove to be intractable for two new settlements so close to one another where they will predate upon the same housing market. The general strategy set out in Policy 1 is supported, particularly the on-going role of the rural centres.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP403	990043		Support. Bassetlaw needs to be innovative at attracting people to the area with appealing modern housing.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP404	990059		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP405	990062		Do not support. BDC are considering 2 very significant developments in close proximity to each other, one of which is also close to a large site that is being considered for development at Ordsall. Without the Ordsall site it will result in 4000 of the 6500 houses being constructed in effectively 1 location. This will not be far off the threshold for a large town whilst not actually supporting the growth of the 2 existing towns. Consideration has not been given for the proposed developments by neighbouring district councils who are also creating garden villages relatively close to these and would also use the same insufficient road networks. The A1 will not cope with the increase in traffic volume. An accident in Newark results in standing traffic at Elkesley within 30 minutes. It needs to become a 3 lane motorway, the A614 needs to become a dual carriageway and the A638, B6387 will certainly not be able to manage	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP410	990076		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP411	990079		No support. I feel the distribution is too heavily centred on one area and should be more evenly distributed throughout Bassetlaw.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP415	990150		Do not support. We do not support the Spatial Strategy for Bassetlaw in terms of the proposed spatial distribution of housing across the District. The approach to housing growth for the three main towns appears again to promote significantly greater concentration upon Workop and Harworth & Bircotes at the expense of Retford, notwithstanding its stronger housing market and consequent housing delivery performance. The respondent has invested strongly in commercial and high quality industrial development in the town and is advancing current proposals to enhance its retail and leisure offer. They feel that their ambitions for Retford are not matched by the extent of housing development proposed, notwithstanding opportunities for growth to the north east and south of the town. The respondents also object to the rigid 'capped' approach to additional housing within the Rural Settlement of Bassetlaw based upon the 'proportionate growth' principle. This approach appears to be defining individual settlement growth down to the last dwelling without assessment and/or recognition of constraints and opportunities that may be present in the respective villages. In the absence of an up to date local plan in recent years, there has been some significant housing growth in the rural areas which has now 'taken up' much if not all of the capacity of certain rural settlements such as Walkeringham. Much of this relatively uncontrolled growth has not been matched by the provision of infrastructure in these settlements and/or the land needed to expand existing community facilities such as local schools and medical facilities. The policies for growth for these rural area should therefore contain flexibility over and above the cap to enable additional land to be identified for development where it clearly assists in the delivery of infrastructure such as the expansion of Walkeringham School.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP416	990240		Do not support. A)The Bassetlaw District Council has, I believe around 7.5 years of Land Stock for Housing. Added to this is the Report in September 2018 (Action on Empty Houses) that there are 1,292 Unoccupied and Substantially Unfurnished Properties in Bassetlaw, of which some 600 are classed as 'Long Term Empty' (over 6 months). These and other such properties should be brought into use before more land is taken for Housing. It is puzzling to see how Villages that, under the current Plan, are "unsustainable for more development" have suddenly changed to being "sustainable" to the point of being required to take a further 20% of housing development. What has changed ?? In Bothamsall, as an example, we have LOST services, not gained, and the suggestion that additional housing will bring services back does not 'hold water'. We have LOST a village shop ! We have LOST a Post Office ! We have LOST a Bus Service of any consequence. Yet we are now "sustainable for development". How has this changed ?? Where Housing Building is to take place it should be placed to reduce the amount of travel that occupiers of these new houses will need to make. Further, existing Industrial and Commercial activities should not be disturbed to make way for Housing when this will result in additional travel by the new Occupiers. Distances as recorded in the ADAS Report Section 4.6 are misleading and inaccurate and appear to be "AS THE CROW FLIES" and not by public road. As examples; Bevercotes to Tuxford shown as 3.9km when it is 8.4km; Bevercotes to Retford, 6.82km vs actual of 11.5km., and to Retford Oaks Academy shown as 7.0km but is nearer to 11.5km., The journey from Bevercotes to Elkesley School is really 9.4km, not the 4.4km quoted.	The Council is required to produce and adopt a local plan which covers at least 15 years. Empty homes cannot be counted towards the housing supply because they are already counted in the housing stock. Therefore it would result in double counting. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments. The anomalies identified will be reviewed.
DBLP418	990387		Support for all policies. The strategy provides a good base on which Neighbourhood Plans can be developed. Villages need to be able to grow at a reasonable rate, which can vary depending on the village, in order to maintain village amenities and enable each village to maintain its character. Thought also has to be given to the provision of services such as schools and medical facilities in the villages. Living in a village in Rural East Bassetlaw, it is important that this local plan takes into account items such as: - the character of these village - the growing demand for schools, particularly primary schools in each village - adequate provision of basic medical needs (doctors surgeries) in the villages - Green space and recreation facilities in each village - Expansion of small businesses in the villages In this way, our villages can thrive which is good in itself, but also good for the environment if people in the village have less need to travel to towns and cities	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council continues to work closely with infrastructure providers to ensure that the plan will deliver any necessary infrastructure associated with new development.
DBLP419	990400		No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP420	990465		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP421	990489		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP422	990506		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP423	990541		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP424	990549		Don't support. Local airfields are an essential part of maintaining an effective and efficient flight training industry in the UK, in turn feeding aviation providers supporting hundreds of thousands of jobs nationally and many thousands locally. Housing development is obviously necessary, but should not come at the expense of airfields around the country.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP425	990570		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP426	990571		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP427	990577		Don't support. Stop building on green and open spaces. Build within the existing urban footprint but not on open or green spaces.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP428	990594		Don't support. Loss of vital aviation site that is beneficial to the local economy.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP429	990613		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP430	990614		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP431	990633		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP434	990659		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP435	990666		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP436	990682		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP437	990704		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP438	990717		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP439	990719		Don't support. A638 is already congested and the rural villages used as cut throughs through the already increased housing in the villages. Rural villages are becoming increasing like mini towns as housing increases. Since Ballards in Markham moor went up the amount of lorries and traffic that go past our houses is noticeable busier. making the junctions harder to get out of more dangerous.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP440	990764		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP441	990783		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP442	990799		Don't support. Overloading local structure, e.g. Rural roads ,services and traffic movement in and around Retford. Gamston site more suitable for industrial use. Having attended one of your excellent Consultation Events it is evident that many residents in the surrounding area are concerned that, having moved to this area for a quiet and peaceful village life, the proposed development could be unacceptable and change this.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The draft plan includes policies to address infrastructure requirements. The Council is working with infrastructure providers to ensure the necessary infrastructure will be delivered to support new development.
DBLP443	990800		Support the identification of Rural Bassetlaw as one of the five Spatial Strategy Strands, this supports proportionate growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development that will support the living, working and environmentally diverse landscape. This also supports Strategic Objective 6 and is in accordance with the NPPF which confirms at Paragraph 83 that planning policies and decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings. Consider the Plan actively seeks to support economic growth in accordance with the NPPF. This Plan sets out the Strategic Policies which will be supported by site allocations to deliver economic growth across the district. FCC's sites at Carlton Forest are suitably located to help to achieve the Council's aspirations and spatial strategy.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP444	990802		Do not support. I have lived in this area for many years and am interested in any potential developments which may happen, I have been an active person in my own village as a parish councillor and community worker in the Retford area as well as having spent my career in public services. Had to 'cut through' the fanciful persuasive language and rhetoric to get to the core of what this Plan represents and its effect on the existing extraordinary rural nature of the South Retford area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP445	990806		Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP446	990814		Do not support. There is no evidence that these houses will be required. There is currently no shortage of housing in Bassetlaw and there is no trend of movement into the area for work related reasons. In fact the large scale traditional jobs such as power stations are under threat.	Thank you for responding to the consultation. The supporting text to Policy 2 sets out the reasoned justification for the housing requirement. The Bassetlaw Economic Development Needs Assessment (December, 2018) includes the assessment of housing need.
DBLP447	990818		Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP448	990826		Do not support. New housing should be concentrated near the town centres & transport hubs (train stations & bus stations) encouraging people to use public transport instead of private transport.	Where possible new housing will be identified in sustainable locations close to existing town centres and transport hubs. However, this is not always possible. Where sites are identified in other locations necessary infrastructure will be sought to ensure that residents have the opportunity to use other modes of transport and not just the private car.
DBLP449	990829		Do not support. I think it is discipable, the area of Retford can't cope as it is on the roads... Having a whole new village built with an average of 2 cars per household will cause mayhem. I for one don't support this.	During the site selection process the Council will work with the Highways Authority to identify appropriate mitigation in relation to highways and other transport infrastructure to ensure that the impact of new housing on roads is minimal.
DBLP450	990836		Do not support. This consultation form appears to have been either written by someone who has absolutely no knowledge and experience of creating a neutral and unbiased questionnaire, or someone who has lots but has a predetermined picture of the results they want to receive...	Thank you for responding to the consultation. The comments form enables the consultee to respond in any way they like. Consultees can also send in their response separately. There is no requirement for consultees to use the form, it was created to gauge opinion on the key issues of the plan.
DBLP451	990837		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP452	990841		Do not support. Gamston airport provides valuable jobs and services to the area. The airport should remain Any development around the old colliery would affect less people	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP453	990842		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP454	990843		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP455	990845		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP456	990846		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP457	990847		Do not support. The locations seem poorly thought out. The information at the consultation event and in the draft plan is lacking.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP458	990848		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP459	990849		Do not support. Concern relates to proposed development at Retford Gamston. This is a nationally import transport hub for GA. Attempts to change this land use directly opposes government policy and will be instrumental in the loss of significant numbers of skilled STEM jobs to the local economy.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP460	990850		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP461	990852		Support. As long as it does not require the closure of Gamston Airport.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP462	990854		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP463	990855		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP464	990856		Do not support. Why are all of your questions leading questions?	The comments form enables the consultee to respond in any way they wish. Consultees can also send in their response separately. There is no requirement for consultees to use the form, it was created to gauge opinion on the key issues of the plan.
DBLP465	990859		Support. However it should not be to the detriment of existing businesses. The Gamston airport supports many businesses and also provides needed leisure activities	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP466	990862		Do not support. This strategy will ruin an aviation community at Gamston, a location that I like to visit and make use of the current facilities. The proposal will ruin this.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP467	990865		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP468	990869		Support. Gamston Airport is not a suitable location for a new village, it is more valuable to the area as an airport.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP469	990882		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP470	990884		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP471	990885		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP472	990886		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP473	990889		Support. Local affordable housing is certainly required within the growing population of not only Bassetlaw but the East Midlands in general.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP474	990891		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP475	990893		Do not support. I don't not support the use of Gamston airfield which is a valuable resource and amenity and should be kept as an airfield. The planning guidelines also don't allow its use, the airfield is mostly green field there is some brownfield, but this is nearly all in current use as a thriving local asset.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP477	990901		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP478	990904		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP479	990910		Do not support. The draft plan for Bassetlaw suggests that the population of the residential settlements will be subject to a proposed increase of 20% inline with all other areas of the district. In rural settings this increase is predicted to be achieved by identified sites within the curtilage of the present villages as well as bringing back into use empty properties and redundant farm buildings. This approach will need the councils commitment to protecting and preserving rural communities. Positioning the proposed Garden Village on the site of the current Gamston Airport goes against the above in placing a new medium sized town of 4000 properties directly adjacent to a current village.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP480	990912		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP481	990913		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP482	990914		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP483	990915		Do not support. The roads are too busy, it will spoil the area. There are alternative places to develop instead of brownfield sites. ie cottam power station	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.

DBLP484	990916		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP485	990917		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP486	990918		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP487	990919		Support. But not at an airport expense	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP488	990921		Do not support. The idea to close vital areas of land, such as the airport to extend a short term goal of extra housing would lose many an attraction to local tourism	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP489	990922		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP490	990926		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP491	990928		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP492	990930		Do not support. The airfield is active, and not something which can easily be replaced. It offers highend employment and training opportunities for youngsters who want to pursue a career in aviation. Many airfields have already been lost around the country, and there is nowhere similar locally. See nothing in the plan to replace the loss of the airfield if it was built on. It is thriving and busy, why should it be closed. I would prefer farmland to be given up than the airfield.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP493	990933		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP494	990934		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP495	990936		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP496	990937		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP497	990938		Do not support. The infrastructure isn't able to cope with the current traffic, ie Retford train station, all the road along Albert road is blocked BOTH SIDES already every morning when trying to access the station plus the 7:37 to Sheffield is already jam packed. I live in the beautiful small village of Eaton and DO NOT want to be overlooking foul built houses, or having any more traffic through the village, there's enough traffic already, a total of 4 cars in 2 years has crashed on the corner where I live, and only last Saturday night a car going TOO FAST crashed on Eaton bridge ending nose first in the river!	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP498	990940		Do not support. Coming from a STEM background myself, the direct loss of highly skilled STEM and technical jobs at the airport, for example flight training and engineering contradicts strategic objectives 4 & 6 stated in the local plan document. I can also garner from the plan the need for local housing in Worksop but I cannot see the same evidence for the need of housing in Retford. According to the plan Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011. Achieved without the need to destroy existing infrastructure. I believe the local plan drastically underestimates the effect of losing Gamston Airport would have and markedly undervalues the specialised services it provides and its contribution to the local economy. Jobs created in a 'Garden Village' are likely to be much lower skilled than those of a thriving flight training Airport and those of the technical and engineering business that run alongside.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP499	990942		Do not support. Whilst agreeing with an general provision of more housing I am strongly against the use of Gamston Airport for this purpose.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP500	990943		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP501	990944		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP502	990946		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP503	M Turner		Do not support. The Draft Local Plan would simply see the destruction of a vital local and national transport facility counter to national policy (NPPF) with no plan to re-instate or support it elsewhere. The Draft Local Plan's destruction of skilled employment to build houses is contradictory to its own strategic objectives 4 and 6 for economic development and fails to recognise the opportunity the airport presents as a local economic hub. The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. The plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, without the need to destroy existing infrastructure. From the local consultation meetings, it appears that the 'garden villages' are to be targeted at Sheffield overspill. This is counter to the documents stated aims and a risky endeavour given the distance from Sheffield. It is likely that commuters living at Retford and working in Sheffield would not be in the 'affordable housing' bracket as transport Sheffield is not easy and costs/travel time is prohibitive. Those willing to travel that distance would therefore be in the minority and not require the scale of development planned. If the plans aim is for Sheffield overspill, then brownfield sites further north on the A1M at Blyth or Tickhill/Styrrup would likely be more successful. The Draft Local Plan fails to provide evidence for the scale of development or the viability of the development at Retford Gamston Airport, or Bevercoates. It is also not backed up with a viable economic argument that would generate the needed employment in the area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP504	990949		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP505	C Taylor		Do not support. NO.It is, too many houses in one area and would it mean the closure of the existing primary school in Gamston in a few years time ? would it be a case ,as it is now that property is built too close together with inadequate parking and inadequate garden space ? A small increase in new homes across the district would be preferred , rather than creating 2 large garden villages. Would you want your family living on a disused colliery site ?	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP506	990952		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP507	990954		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP508	990955		Do not support. I understand the need for housing, however I feel that just building new housing is not the answer. Grade 1 and 2 listed buildings are left to go in to disrepair, there are empty houses up and down the country that could be developed etc.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP509	990959		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP510	990961		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP511	990962		Support. Extremely concerned at the proposed closure of Gamston airport which is an extremely valuable asset to the area. I am a private pilot who uses the facilities at Gamston for private and business flying for hangarage and for maintenance . I am sure that there are sufficient other sites which are available for housing without sacrificing this airfield.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP512	990964		Do not support. The National Planning Policy Framework is changing to safeguard a national infrastructure of airfields. This means airfields are unsuitable for inclusion in plans for housing developments. Local Councils, County Councils and property developers will all save a lot of time and money by making themselves aware of this and stop trying to turn airfields into housing. Please refer to the All-Party Parliamentary Group for Aviation for further information at http://www.generalaviationppg.uk/	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP513	990965		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP514	990980		Do not support. The destruction of an active, vibrant airfield and its associated work opportunities including highly skilled STEM jobs and its provision of vital communications links for businesses in the area, and the creation of two whole new villages with no parallel employment opportunities, will create huge problems for this area's future, West Burton & Cottam power stations are partially or wholly closing down, a fact you ignore. Retford will be inundated with unemployed inhabitants and local transport routes will be inadequate for the increased usage. Far better that growth is organically based on existing towns and villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP515	991045		Do not support. No, the construction of a housing estate at Retford airport and the loss of skilled jobs and infrastructure this would cause would be a disaster for the local area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP516	991153		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP517	991157		Support. I agree Bassetlaw needs more housing but distributed across the region so as to not impact on the infrastructure in one particular area in such a huge way.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP518	991172		Do not support. Don't believe it has considered all the options fully, it's mainly assumptions made on behalf of other agencies and organisations and has not consulted the population correctly.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP520	991174		Do not support. I don't believe it has considered all the options fully, it's mainly assumptions made on behalf of other agencies and organisations and has not consulted the population correctly. It gave very little notice at the beginning of the consultation so much so that large swathes of the local residents did not know about it.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP519	991173		Do not support. Purely for logistic problems. Leave the pretty villages and picturesque Retford alone please!	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP521	991176		Do not support. No - I think the major areas of development/new homes should be in the towns where there are stations/better transport links.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.

DBLP522	991178		Do not support. Firstly , The overall strategy of the plan appears to be a complete U Turn from the previous plan when it advised that rural development and housing was unsustainable. I know we need more housing the 20% increase for the surrounding villages is probably enough as it is without overwhelming a small area of the district with housing. A 10% increase would be better as this would increase the population by the same figure. Employment is the most important factor for East Bassetlaw, I feel that the jobs should be created first then the housing , rather than the other way round , as people would just migrate to the surrounding areas and we wouldn't see the economic growth .	The Council has worked closely with neighbourhood plan groups in rural areas over the past few years. Over that time it has become apparent, from discussions with the groups, that there is a need for some development in the rural settlements to help support the existing services and enable people living in those areas to remain there i.e. those wanting to downsize or access their first home. The 20% is a cap, not a requirement. The plan proposes a 10% requirement, which is considered appropriate taking into consideration past growth since 2010. All applications would be determined against a criteria based policy which seeks to preserve the character of rural settlements. Additionally, the Council will take into consideration policies in made (and emerging depending on their status) neighbourhood plans.
DBLP523	991181		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP524	991184		Do not support. The draft plan has failed in its own stated objective to be in conformity with the NPPF with having totally ignored Paragraph 104 f) of the NPPF dated July 2018 which clearly states that Bassetlaw Council should "recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy." The Council has also totally failed to justify its statement that Retford Gamston Airport is an "inefficient use of land" given that:- It is home to 10 businesses (11 including Gamston Aviation Ltd) - It provides employment for almost 100 people and a very high number being STEM jobs - It provides a training facility for Nottinghamshire Police - provides a base for a Children's Air Ambulance - with 11 hangars it provides a base for not only the aircraft used by the businesses on site but also over 50 additional privately and business owned aircraft - It provides a strategic resource to Bassetlaw for business and leisure air travel that cannot be fulfilled by Doncaster Sheffield Airport or any other airfield / airport within close proximity. - It has 96 hectares on the wider airport site that is in continual use as productive arable BMV farm land. I do however support the redevelopment of the former Bevercotes Colliery site as it has currently no other utilisation, is attracting misuse and the potential for anti-social behaviour and its development has no impact on business or job losses, no loss of productive farmed land and no loss of a strategic and well used resource to Bassetlaw as is the case with the Retford Gamston Airport site.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP525	991186		Do not support. The proposal for the Bevercotes site is fine. Either this or commercial/warehousing development. The proposal for Gamston Airport is wholly inappropriate. This is a valuable 21st century commercial asset in the area and as such important for providing employment and attracting investment. It is not a 'brownfield' site. There must be other more suitable redundant sites in the area (Cottam PS ??)	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP526	991188		Do not support. This plan involves the closure of Gamston Airport.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP527	991190		Support. As a local Gamston resident I am delighted that the village has the opportunity to advance with modern services and infrastructure, relevant to the people in its society. The village has no amenities and the opportunity to have a shop or services to the public would be fantastic. Furthermore, as I currently am unable to drive due to health, bus routes only allow a service to Retford and once every Friday to Lincoln and not on Sunday. This offers little choice and limited facilities. I have a young child, if I want to take him anywhere I am trapped as again there is no provision in any of the 5 villages. No park or entertainment only fields. Again, very limited jobs. I currently work part time and have to commute by train to Lincoln. The opportunity of local jobs would be excellent not only for the local infrastructure but for the future of my child. 100% support this development. People often do not consider positions of 'the unheard' voices of those that are disabled and currently this plan gives equality to residents of Bassetlaw.	Your support is welcomed. Thank you for your comments.
DBLP528	991208		Do not support. I support the need for more housing in Bassetlaw but do not think that two garden villages should be created. Bassetlaw need to stop listening to NIMBY's and work with landowners who want to develop land in villages. Affordable housing should be a preference not massive houses which locals cannot afford. Bassetlaw should be obliged to contact and work proactively with landowners not to ignore what they want to do with their own land.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP529	991209		Do not support Spatial Strategy Proposing that Carlton in Lindrick, Langold, Mistoron and Tuxford form a 6th spatial tier representing as they do approximately 11% of Bassetlaw's population. Within this tier the 4 settlements to receive individual assessments as to what % growth they can achieve. This could result in an increase or decrease over the 10% hr / 20% cap.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP530	991219		Do not support. Too many houses, not enough jobs for all these people.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP531	991221		Do not support. I believe this plan is poorly designed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP532	Garreth Evans		No support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP533	991230		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP534	991231		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP535	991234		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP536	991235		Do not support. Retford and Workshops' new housing targets have been reduced to make way for the proposed development of the Garden Villages. By placing most of the development in one place, you are not achieving an even balance. The new development should be evenly spread around Bassetlaw.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP537	991237		Do not support. Whilst the addition of 10-20% increase in properties in rural locations is a sensible approach to increasing housing in Bassetlaw. The addition of the 2 "garden villages" is completely disproportionate to the size of Retford, it's infrastructure and the locations close to the locations.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP538	991240		Do not support. I understand the UK has a shortage of properties but I do not believe that there is the demand in Retford for this number of houses. Nor do I believe there is the industry to support this growth in population.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP539	991241		Do not support. To much housing in a protected rural area. The two garden villages are only one mile apart.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP540	991243		Do not support. I do not support this proposal if it means losing Gamston Airport. There is a great infrastructure in place at Gamston Airport, numerous jobs would be lost as well as individuals recreational activities. You are not supporting small businesses by doing this, and you can build elsewhere as there is other land available. A poor decision by Bassetlaw District Council, to throw away local business and quality infrastructure for the sake of new housing. It seems as though you have come to this decision too easily and should be spending money assisting what is already in place in the local area. If new housing is required, why is it on this scale, quality should be thought of over quantity and no businesses should be lost because of it.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP541	991264		Do not support the use of an existing airfield for new housing development. To describe Gamston (Retford) airfield as brownfield flies in the face of known government guidance. The airfield is the only one in this part of the UK capable of serving general aviation traffic. Other airfields are either too small, military, or full commercial civil airline operations sites.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP542	991336		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP543	991990		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP544	992014		Do not support. The applicant is disregarding the need for a national infrastructure of aviation facilities around the UK.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP545	992366		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP546	992635		Do not support. The plan will destroy nationally important aviation infrastructure leading to the loss of advanced technology and engineering businesses and pilot training. It will also leave the Children's Air Ambulance without a base in the Retford area and will result in the loss of approximately 100 highly skilled jobs.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP547	993337		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP548	993387		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
Policy 2: Housing and Economic Growth				
DBLP2	Miss S Gaskell		Supports the number of homes proposed. Hopes it will include social housing because there is a lack of Council homes available in Worksoop. Private renting is very costly. Know some young people who are in their thirties still living with their parents.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP2	Miss S Gaskell		Supports the proposed amount of employment land. There is not enough jobs in Worksoop, why should young people have to travel to Sheffield or Mansfield, want more in this town. Worksoop has been in decline since the pits shutdown.	Support for the amount of employment land noted. The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure economic growth and jobs can take place in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of employment growth in the future.
DBLP3	Mr P Crawley		Fully support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksoop, Harworth and the rural villages. Believe strongly that they are needed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP4	Mrs E Crawley		Fully support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksoop, Harworth and the rural villages. Believe strongly that they are needed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP5	Mr B Crawley		Fully support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages. Believe strongly that they are needed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP6	Mr & Mrs C Fletcher		Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages. Believe strongly that they are needed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP8	J Kerley		Support the proposals that future houses should be built to expand areas of Harworth and Worksop and rural villages and these are sensible and suitable for large numbers of new properties to be sited.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP9	Mr & Mrs T Noble		Confirm that many of the Plan's proposals on future housing and employment in the District are welcome. Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP10	Mr & Mrs P West		Confirm with the Plan's proposals on future housing and employment in the District. Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP11	Mr & Mrs S Wilson		Think many of the Plan's proposals for future housing and employment are well thought through and are in favour of them. Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP16	Mr T Bray		Support the number of homes - new housing is needed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP16	Mr T Bray		Would prefer the use of brownfield land for employment wherever possible	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure economic growth and associated jobs can take place in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of employment growth in the future. This will include the use of brownfield land.
DBLP20	P Launders		Many of the Plan's proposals for future housing and employment in the District are welcomed. Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP21	Mr & Mrs B Hopps		Many of the Plan's proposals for future housing and employment in the District are welcomed. Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP24	F Ieromino		Supports the number of homes proposed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP24	F Ieromino		Supports the proposed amount of employment land.	Support for amount of employment land noted.
DBLP27	Mrs R Owen		Many of the Plan's proposals for future housing and employment are welcomed. Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP28	Mr S Owen		Agree with many of the future proposals on housing and employment. Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP31	Clir J Ogle		Another proposal is to ask adjoining areas such as Rotherham and Sheffield to take some of Bassetlaw's supposed government housing requirement. An increased population does not guarantee economic growth. Economic growth can be outstanding as education, business innovation and communication and IT advances and efficient work contribute to increased prosperity. An increased ageing population is likely to be a liability to Bassetlaw imposed from outside by an influx of non locals.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Bassetlaw has a duty to cooperate with neighbouring authorities. There are no plans for the Council to ask neighbouring authorities to meet the district's housing needs at the present time as there is enough land available within Bassetlaw.
DBLP31	Clir J Ogle		Does not support the number of homes proposed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP31	Clir J Ogle		Does not support the proposed amount of employment land.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP32	H Bennett		Supports the number of homes proposed - support the need to provide dwellings but this should take into account the use of existing buildings which are either redundant or have capacity to provide housing e.g. over shops. The overall result will be that the area will move from being rural to being urbanised.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. There is a need for housing in all areas of Bassetlaw to ensure that services in rural settlements are supported.
DBLP32	H Bennett		Supports the proposed amount of employment land.	Support for amount of employment land noted.
DBLP36	J Trotter		Understand that the total number of houses is dictated by government hope it is part of the Council's duty to question whether the figure is accurate and needed. Have lived in Retford for 40 years and Gamston for over 10 have seen employment in the area diminish year on year. Before more housing the area needs more employment, if people cannot get a mortgage having 1000's of properties does not help. Concern that there is a need for so many houses in such a rural location - currently there are over 5500 houses for sale on Rightmove within a 15 mile radius of Retford town centre. Over 1200 are 1-2 bed properties which could be starter or first homes. If there was a massive availability of people who could afford these houses then this number would be less.	Thank you for responding to the consultation. The supporting text to Policy 2 sets out the reasoned justification for the housing requirement. The Bassetlaw Economic Development Needs Assessment (December, 2018) includes the assessment of housing need.
DBLP61	J Mann MP	Parliamentary Candidate for Bassetlaw	Many of the proposals for future housing and employment in the District are welcome.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP61	J Mann MP	Parliamentary Candidate for Bassetlaw	Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP67	A Middleton		Welcome the overall strategy reflected in the plan to locate new development in locations where the current road and other infrastructure have capacity to accommodate new development without serious negative impact on current residential areas.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP67	A Middleton		Support the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP70	N and E Housego		Support the proposals for further housing in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP72	F and D Brown		Support further homes being built but we think these proposals would be better suited to areas like Worksop, Harworth and other rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP73	K Lamb		Welcome the proposals for housing expansion in Worksop, Harworth and the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP97	M Naylor	Lound Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Concerned about the extent of housing development in the village. Have organised a number of village consultation events in the past three years, including a detailed survey of residents about the future of the village and discussions about the type, number and location of new houses that might be built here. From this it is clear that the majority of residents would like to see only limited, or indeed no, new housing development in Lound. This said, most people are realistic about this issue and recognise that Lound must play its part in dealing with the present national housing shortage. Accordingly, we have noted that BDC has methodically established a 10% Requirement figure for our village as the housing need up to 2035 in accordance with the NPPF. In response have prepared a credible plan to meet this target in Lound by allocating sites and adopting a Windfall Policy. However, that to allow development beyond this level, possibly up to BDC's 20% Cap, would be unwanted and unnecessary in Lound. However, recognise that some communities, which have the need for further development, are still rightly free to plan above the Cap. Suggest that, instead of the proposed fixed percentage Cap, each Neighbourhood should, using the BDC Requirement as a minimum, be given the flexibility to plan for a maximum level of development, which might be identical to the Requirement, and that is appropriate for its area and its people. This would be a simple system, which would provide BDC with the housing requirement that it needs up to 2035. At the same time it would give individual communities direct power to develop to a greater or lesser extent in a way appropriate to their localities.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council considers that an equitable approach is appropriate because development in one village has the potential to support services in another village (as identified in national policy - NPPF paragraph 78).
DBLP99	J & C Cruddas		The information provided suggested that there were no appropriate housing development sites available in Scrooby due to highway, flooding, utilities infrastructure capacity restraints and green field limitations. Believe it would be common sense to move Scrooby to the list of 33 settlements that are deemed inappropriate for development. To suggest that Scrooby should still aim to provide sites for 15 to 25 houses is clearly a wasteful bureaucratic nonsense when set in the context of a requirement throughout the District for over 6800 such sites, the shortfall being less than 0.36% of the total requirement. Appreciate the Bassetlaw Plan has a 17 year Lifespan so any future Scrooby development can be dealt with on an adhoc one off basis.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council considers that an equitable approach is appropriate because development in one village has the potential to support services in another village (as identified in national policy - NPPF paragraph 78).

DBLP101	J Chatterton	William Davis Ltd	NPPF para 11 states "Strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing" and that "Plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area, and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change". Moreover, the NPPF requires local authorities to include an appropriate buffer of 5%, 10% or 20% against this minimum need (para 7.3). The purpose of this is to ensure that where supply falls below the required amount, there are immediate provisions to address the deficit. This reinforces the NPPF's expectation that local plans are to have in-built flexibility. In preparing a Local Plan that aims to address the minimum housing target with no contingency, it would be dependent on every allocation delivering on time and at capacity without fail. If one site provides fewer dwellings than expected or is delayed, then the Council would fail to deliver the minimum number of houses required to meet its need. That would fail to provide an appropriate housing strategy in line with NPPF and render the Plan unsound. The Council must establish a suitable buffer against its identified need. The Local Plans Expert Group recommended to Government in 2016 that such a buffer should be at least 20% of the identified need in order to ensure flexibility in a local plan. The NPPF does not invalidate this recommendation. The need for a buffer is essentially acknowledged within Table 3 of the draft Plan which shows a lapse rate of 25% for sites with Planning Permission for the five years up to 2015. Applying this rate to the 284 homes required in Workstop by 2035 would give 355. This figure should be the minimum residual allocation for the town within the Plan for it to be considered sound. An overarching and vital requirement of the emerging Plan is its need to be resilient and able to respond to shortfalls in the deliverability of allocated sites with additional and suitable allocations. This is particularly applicable with the Council proposing two New Settlements. Large-scale developments such as these are synonymous with slow delivery. When considering the Bevercotes site is a nature reserve and there is no set date for the closure of Gamston Airfield, which contains a series of extant business operations, it must be accepted that the delivery of dwellings on these sites may be particularly slow. Moreover, these proposals will require Environmental Impact Assessment and subsequent pre-commencement conditions as well as lengthy Section 106 discussions which will further delay the delivery of homes on site. The Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners study "Start to Finish" (2016) noted that the average planning approval period for large sites is circa 5 years from validation to decision. Given that these sites are expected to deliver 1,000 homes by 2035, and a decision cannot be expected until 2026 at the earliest (with the Local Plan's adoption estimated at 2021) there would be a combined delivery of 111 dwellings per annum from an anticipated decision date required. This is extremely ambitious, especially when acknowledging the constraints of each site. Moreover the Bassetlaw 2018 Five year Housing Land Supply Statement estimates average build out rates for a single volume builder within the District to be 30-35 per annum (para 2.10.) This delivery rate would only provide up to 630 dwellings by the end of the plan period at these sites, assuming there to be only one outlet on site, which is standard practice for the initial development of large allocations due to infrastructure phasing. This would leave a deficit of at least 470 homes. Therefore, the allocation of more sites is required within to accommodate this anticipated shortfall in delivery during the Plan Period.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy taking into consideration comments received in response to the public consultation. The Council will be required to meet the housing requirement plus an uplift of at least 5% (buffer) to demonstrate a five year housing land supply.
DBLP101	J Chatterton	William Davis Ltd	To address the above shortfalls in provision within Workstop suggest that a minimum of 355 dwellings be allocated within the town. See SADBPL3	The Council is proposing to allocate land for approximately 1000 dwellings in Workstop.
DBLP110	K Crisp	Cushman & Wakefield on behalf of Stancilffe Homes	Refers to S20(5 (b)) and S21(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and NPPF paras 35, 16, 31 and PPG paras 029 and 32. Sets out the approach in the NPPF/PPG to assessing OAN. Having regard to this the Plan does not meet the tests of 'soundness' and as such should not be adopted in its current form. The Five-Year Housing Land Supply Statement (2018) considers that there is a deliverable supply of 2,674 dwellings which equates to a 7.9 year supply when assessed against the housing target. This includes sites which are committed, under construction or a Neighbourhood Plan Allocation. Have undertaken an assessment of the housing land supply using Policy 2's OAN of 6630 (390dpa) and the Housing Delivery Test 2018 results of 1,348 homes delivered to 2018. Have not undertaken any work to confirm the council's supply position (2681 dwellings). Based on a deliverable housing supply of 2,674 dwellings, equates to a 6.5 year supply when assessed against the total five year housing target of 2,050 dwellings. This shows that Bassetlaw has a surplus of 624 dwellings. 6.5 years supply of housing land should not preclude sites not considered as part of this assessment coming forward for development. Chapter 6 identifies the future development needs and notes that Bassetlaw is not required to meet any unmet housing need for any neighbouring authorities. The supporting text notes a lower housing requirement than the SHMA. The SHMA recommends a housing requirement of 374. Para 6.13 notes the wider considerations on housing delivery and need from past trends, the 2017 SHMA Update findings, and the 2018 EDNA, that the Council needs to plan for more homes than the minimum standard housing result for Bassetlaw (306 dpa). Consider that a local plan housing requirement of 390 dwellings per annum 2018 - 2035 is appropriate. Policy 2 identifies a total housing requirement of 6,330 dwellings 2018 - 2035 calculated following the NPPF Standardised Methodology as a minimum (ie 306 dwellings per annum) taking account of the need to support modest economic growth. Policy 2 sets a District wide housing requirement of 6,330 dwellings split between each of the 5 strategy areas, with Rural Bassetlaw 1,777 dwellings. Support an uplift of the OAN figure of 374dpa to deliver c.390dpa. As recognised in recent planning appeal decisions, this figure should not be a ceiling but a minimum. Delivery of housing and economic growth above this figure should look to be supported in the policy, where it would result in sustainable development and which is supported by other policies in the plan. Policy 2 refers to 390 dwellings per annum. This is an uplift of the minimum standard housing results for Bassetlaw (374 dpa) identified by the SHMA 2017. Agree that this uplift would help to deliver housing to meet the population and economic growth but that this should not be considered as a ceiling limit for each strategy area. Propose rewording to note that these are minimum requirements: Bassetlaw District's housing requirement for the period 2018 to 2035 is as a minimum 6,630 dwellings. Change Table column 2 header Minimum provision required 2018 to 2035 and by under table add and through allocations identified in... (Table X/Policy X). Policy 2 should include a requirement for the redistribution of the balance of housing should delivery be delayed or prevented in other locations. This can be reported/ tested every year in the AMR and five-year housing land supply assessments. Consider there are opportunities for additional housing within the strategy areas.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. As identified in national policy and guidance, the standard method calculation is the minimum number of homes which should be planned for. At the time of writing, this equates to 306 dwellings per annum for Bassetlaw.
DBLP115	M Eagland	Peacock & Smith on behalf of Gleeson Regeneration Ltd	The next update of the median workplace-based affordability ratio is in March 2019. Should ensure that the base standard methodology calculation is updated in light of this new data. Average housing delivery over the Core Strategy plan period 2010 - 2018 was 329 dwellings per annum (dpa), which is materially below the requirement of 350. The 2017 SHMA recommended a housing requirement of 374 dpa. It is clear that there has been under-delivery of housing, which will have influenced in-migration and the ability of households to form. Given the household projections in the standard housing methodology are trend-based and constrained by housing supply consider that there is a compelling case to incorporate a sufficiently high uplift above the base methodology figure to compensate for under-delivery. Evidence base does not include an up to date assessment of the housing requirement that considers this issue. There is a risk that the housing requirement is too low, contrary to Government objectives to significantly boost the supply of new homes. The Plan incorporates an adjustment to the standard base figure to take account of economic growth. However, the midpoint OE forecast used as a basis for this adjustment, 390 dpa, is below the high growth forecast of 518 dpa. Note that the EDNA comments that given commitments in the District and the potential of the distribution market, a positive approach to development may enable a higher level growth. The 2017 SHMA sets out a high economic growth forecast of 417 dpa and recommends that this higher growth scenario is tested by the Council as the NPPF seeks to proactively and positively drive sustainable economic growth. Consider that the economic growth adjustment to the standard methodology base figure requires further justification and sensitivity testing. There is a risk that the housing requirement is too low, contrary to Government objectives to significantly boost the supply of new homes. Concerns regarding the proposed split of the housing requirement between the various settlements within the hierarchy. The equitable distribution of growth strategy fails to recognize the role and function of Workstop as the largest settlement in the District with the greatest range of shops, services and employment. The plan proposes a disproportionate amount of the housing requirement to rural settlements and garden villages, this is likely to lead to unsustainable patterns of development. The logic and need for the garden villages as opposed to urban extensions to Workstop and other established settlements has not been justified. Concerns that the scale of housing growth proposed for garden villages, 1000 dwellings each within the plan period, is not sufficient to allow for these developments to become viable sustainable communities with associated services, shops, employment opportunities and public transport. Whilst further homes are proposed within each garden village beyond the plan period, this would be post 2035, creating a potential situation where significant numbers of homes are created without sufficient supporting infrastructure or employment. The proposed housing requirement needs further justification, particularly in relation to the historic under-delivery of housing in the District and the economic growth adjustment to the standard methodology base figure. The housing requirement for Workstop should be increased to reflect its status as the largest settlement in the District with the greatest range of shops and services and employment opportunities. An appropriate share would be that level set out in the Core Strategy.	The methods used to assess the delivery of housing fully accord with the requirements of the NPPF. Housing land supply will continue to be reviewed as necessary.
DBLP127	C Robinson	TwelveTwentyOne Planning Services on behalf of Hamlin Estates	Do not support the number of homes proposed. It is considered that this will neither meet housing needs or provide sufficient flexibility to ensure delivery of sufficient housing. Any housing target should be a minimum housing delivery target rather than become a constraint to delivery. The proposed contribution of 1000 dwellings to overall housing needs from the proposed two new villages is highly uncertain for the reasons set out above. It is considered that the contribution from existing rural centres can be increased to at least 2250. This will help redress any shortfall in the contribution from the proposed new villages as well as helping to provide additional flexibility over overall housing delivery.	As identified in national policy and guidance, the standard method calculation for housing need is the minimum number of new homes which should be delivered. This equates to 306 dwellings per annum for Bassetlaw at the time of writing.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	The Plan correctly identifies the Standardised Methodology for calculating Objectively Assessed Need (SMOAN) as the starting point for calculating needs. Agree that 2018 is the correct starting point for the Local Plan and the housing requirement should commence in 2018. The Plans housing requirement should extend at least 15 years beyond the date of adoption in accordance with NPPF para 22. With the Plan proposed to be adopted in February 2021, this would require a plan period to at least 2036. If that adoption timescale slips by one month the plan will not be adopted until the policy year 2021/22 meaning that the plan will need to plan to the year 2036/37 as a minimum. Agree that the 2014 based population projections are to be used for the calculation of the SMOAN and that this figure provides a SMOAN of 306 dwellings per annum (dpa). Agree that the SMOAN should be considered as a minimum starting point for housing needs. Refers to PPG housing and economic needs assessments, para 10 which addresses when it might be appropriate to plan for a higher housing need figure than the standard method indicates. Agree that there is a need to consider economic growth and to ensure that enough homes are delivered to support this	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will review the Plan period and make amendments if it is considered necessary.

DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>The Council consider that there are a deliverable and developable supply of 3,949 dwellings within the District comprising 4,523 dwellings on sites with planning permission (as of 1 April 2018) and 193 dwellings on sites allocated in Neighbourhood Development Plans; minus a lapse rate of 26% for small sites and 25% for larger sites where those site's haven't commenced development. It is not clear what evidence the Council is relying on. The Council's latest published update for the supply of housing sites (as of 1 April 2018) appears within the Council's 5 Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement dated October 2018. Assume this is the basis for calculating the Council's deliverable and developable supply, albeit no document is referenced within the Local Plan. That statement at Appendix 2 lists those committed and under construction. They comprise 1,436 dwellings under construction, 1,579 dwellings on large committed sites (and those with a resolution to grant), 279 yet to be delivered (at 2017/18) on small sites and dwellings deliverable on NDP Allocations. The above comprises a total of 3,362 dwellings before discount or 2,897 dwellings once the above lapse rates have been taken into account. Clearly those figures have been updated, or the Council is taking into account separate figures but it is not clear where those figures have been published. It would be prudent to provide an update to the Council's identified housing land supply with an up to date list of Sites which still have planning permission and discount those where permissions have lapsed. Request that the Council published tables of supply and similar information with totals and subtotals within their evidence to enable scrutiny. Until some clarity has been provided with regards to the above, we reserve the right to make further comment on the appropriateness of the Council's identified housing land supply. If our assessment were to be correct the residual housing requirement found through housing allocations would increase from 2,681 to some 3,733 dwellings. Taking into account comments with regard to the plan period this would increase to at least 4,123 to account for at least an 18 year plan period. Should the housing requirement be uplifted to account for a mid-point growth scenario sites would need to be allocated to accommodate at least 5,131 dwellings or, if adjusted for a high growth scenario sites for some 7,183 would need to be allocated. Object to Part 1 of Policy 2 which sets out how development will be distributed across the District. A fundamental element of the Local Plan at this stage is a methodology or strategy for the selection and assessment of strategic sites that the Council will seek to allocate for development. Where Site allocations are to be allocated through a Part 2 Local Plan it is vital that the Part 1 Local Plan sets out how that process will be undertaken. Paras 6.38 - 6.48 describe the current and past economic conditions of the District and reference the EDNA. Do not have any substantial concerns regarding the assessment of the current economic circumstances within the District. Do not dispute that, if the prevailing market conditions continue and the proposed level of housing development is delivered that the overall employment needs can be readily met within the District. Do not dispute that 136ha (gross) employment land will be adequate to meet that need arising.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The whole plan housing trajectory will be included in the next draft plan which will include proposed site allocations.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>Fundamentally object to the economical approach of the Local Plan which lacks the ambition of previous versions. The economic strategy of Policy 2 lacks a vision for growth or a clear expression of how the Council will seek to react to and take advantage of the economic opportunities which are presented by the District's strengths and geographical location. The key opportunities have been overlooked – an economy which is linked and connected to such a large amount of dominant centres (Sheffield, Rotherham, Doncaster, Nottingham, Chesterfield and Lincoln) as set out in para 6.41. Para 6.47 identifies the emerging market for development along the A1 corridor within the north of the district; no doubt a market fuelled by the influence of the above over strategically important dominant centres. The Local Plan does not provide a strategy to capitalise on those opportunities or set out the threats that they may pose, and how they might be managed. It is currently reactionary to those external forces. The district has an abundance of employment sites in strategically advantageous locations, such as land to the south of Harworth, which can be promoted for growth to capitalise on the emerging market for distribution and industrial land. This should be expressly set out in the Local Plan. It is disappointing to see the diminishment of the aspirational approach of the 'Initial Draft' and reduction of enthusiasm to benefit from and contribute towards the levels of growth planned for the SCR and for D2N2. Whilst Policy 2 seeks to deliver 8ha employment land per annum across the plan period, this compares to an average of 11.8ha of employment land delivered every year in Bassetlaw between 2006 and 2016 which included a substantial period of recession and austerity. Welcome the expression of the development quantum within Policy 2 as a minimum level of development. Object to the allocation of 27% of housing development towards the rural area (43% if including proposed new villages), the inappropriateness of those rural allocations is highlighted by the lack of proposed rural employment land proposed to be allocated (15%). The Local Plan's proposed strategy for rural settlements risks allocating a disproportionate level of development to unsustainable locations whilst undermining the vitality of the rural hubs (Retford) which meet their needs. It is necessary to allocate current significant employment commitments so as to establish a suitable baseline position for the Local Plan. Consider land to the south of Harworth should be allocated to secure its future delivery and enable the site to be brought forward flexibly through the planning system and over the course of the plan period.</p>	<p>The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure economic growth and associated jobs can take place in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of employment growth in the future. The spatial strategy will be reviewed to reflect comments made.</p>
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Table 6 sets out the number of dwellings proposed to be allocated towards each of the 3 main settlement, the rural area and the garden villages. Object to the overall amount of development proposed within the plan, its distribution across the main settlements (and allocation towards the rural areas and new villages) and have concerns with the lack of evidence supplied for the committed development that the Council is relying on in column b.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council has taken the data from the housing monitoring data which includes current planning permissions. The whole plan housing trajectory will be published as evidence for the next draft Plan.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Request clarification on the first sentence in para 6.46 where the Local Plan states a requirement to provide '8'; we assume that the word 'hectares' has been omitted.	Yes that's correct. This will be amended.
DBLP138	I Carter	Bothamsall Parish Council	Does not support the number of homes proposed: the local roads in particular Main Street in Bothamsall are already unacceptably busy as a cut through during rush hour. Accommodating a large proportion of Bassetlaw's housing requirements at the garden villages will inevitably lead to a lot more traffic through the village of Bothamsall, in particular traffic destined for Mansfield and the M1. The total number of dwellings proposed is too high, and too concentrated within the Bothamsall and Gamston parishes. Bothamsall Parish Council Figures from the interactive speed sign shows that between 21/03/2018 and 10/02/2019 the number recorded was 1404 per day and this is in one direction. A similar number is recorded at both ends of the village which means we have around 2808 vehicles per day. On a yearly basis this all adds up to a staggering 1,023,825 with 52.71% recorded at over the legal speed limit of 30mph. This is rural madness. Among all these figures a large number of HGV vehicles pass illegally through our little rural village.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP138	I Carter	Bothamsall Parish Council	Supports the amount of employment land proposed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP142	M Malcolm	Ranskill Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council found the figures provided in the plan relating to growth and housing needs confusing and unclear. The ONS figures on p14 give an estimated population growth of 5000 in the plan period. The NPPF standardised methodology results in 5202 dwellings required over the plan period (306 per year). The plan intends to build 6630 new homes over the period - more than the number required by the NPPF and taking into account the ONS data more than 1 house per person. The above growth is justified by quoting economic forecast models there is practically no information as to how this economic growth is to be achieved. Would welcome further explanation, i.e. what is the strategy to attract employment to the area for these new residents, unless the intention is for Bassetlaw to provide dormitory accommodation for individuals working in Sheffield or Doncaster. If this is the case then this would be a matter for concern. Experience has shown that residents who have no previous ties to the area and move into a village because of the convenience of commuting to and from a distant work place are less likely to take a stake in the local community, something which is essential for villages to thrive. Much more focus needs to be made on creating jobs for this projected growth in population.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The NPPF indicates that the standard method calculation is a minimum housing figure. National guidance advises that Councils should consider increasing this where a recent housing need assessment identifies a higher housing need. The Council's Economic Development Need Assessment (December 2018) indicates that there is a requirement to deliver 390 dpa based on the need to support future employment growth.
DBLP143	George Breed	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	<p>In consideration of economic growth factors and past lapse rate trends BDC has processed the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw SHMA (2017) to settle on an annual housing requirement figure of 390 dwellings. The plan doesn't state the housing growth target 6630 dwellings is a minimum requirement. Bassetlaw's assessment of economic need revised down SHMA economic growth OAN figure of 417 dwellings per annum utilising 3 economic forecast models. Given the 17 year term of the plan period and inherent susceptibility of forecast models to error it would be prudent for any OAN figure to be expressed as a minimum requirement. The NPPF requires the Local Plan to set out the level and type of affordable housing provision required together with other necessary infrastructure but such policies should not undermine the deliverability of the Local Plan. Affordable housing need within Bassetlaw is comparatively high with over 134 affordable homes required per annum over the plan period (SHMA 2017). To achieve this target a 35% Affordable Housing threshold would be necessary - due to the relative low net development values achievable in Bassetlaw such a target is not feasible (Policy 3 refers). The SHMA determines an uplift of 10% would be prudent to account for affordable housing demand. The current Housing and Economic Growth figures do not appear to provide sufficient detail on how the proposed OAN means to satiate demand for affordable housing within Bassetlaw. Before submission of the Local Plan, encourage the Council to act positively and push for the more ambitious growth OAN target of 417 dwellings per annum to be expressed as a minimum requirement.</p>	Thank you for your comments which are noted. As identified in national policy and guidance, the standard method calculation is the minimum number of homes which should be planned for. At the time of writing, this equates to 306 dwellings per annum for Bassetlaw. This will be kept under review, as required by national guidance.
DBLP144	P Eaglen		Do not support the overall strategy, including the spatial distribution of housing, for Bassetlaw. In the Core Strategy Policy CS9 made it clear that 77 villages would not be supported for development. Service/facility provision has got worse over the 8 years so why is it okay for these new houses to be built. Where are all the new jobs going to be created and how far will people have to travel. Bothamsall in the last few years have had one or two planning applications turned down which I supported, and am broadly in favour of a very small number of controlled new dwellings in the village providing they are in keeping with our small rural village. The maximum of 15 is far too high, the sewage system is falling regularly and traffic is a major issue. Figures from the interactive speed sign shows that between 21/03/2018 and 10/02/2019 the number recorded was 1404 per day and this is in one direction. A similar number is recorded at both ends of the village which means we have around 2808 vehicles per day. On a yearly basis this all adds up to a staggering 1023825 with 52.71% recorded at over the legal speed limit of 30mph. This is rural madness. Among all these figures a large number of HGV vehicles pass illegally through our little rural village.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council considers that an equitable approach is appropriate because development in one village has the potential to support services in another village (as identified in national policy - NPPF paragraph 78). Many of the rural settlements have not experienced any growth in the past few years. There is a need to support services in rural areas and this can be achieved by enabling more development in these areas.
DBLP144	P Eaglen		Do not support the number of homes to 2035. The total number of dwellings is too high and to concentrated within Bothamsall and Gamston Parishes. Inevitably more traffic will be racing through our village putting residents and property at risk. Must not forget the many cyclists who travel through our village on the National Cycle Route.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP147	R Irving	ID Planning on behalf of The Haworth Group	Harworth is identified as a settlement that requires between 2018 and 2035 1,400 new dwellings in a settlement. Clearly the planning application for land off Scrooby Road and North of Snape Lane, Harworth will go a considerable way to meeting this target requirement, delivering the much-needed housing in the district focused on the Harworth area. Policy 11 refers to a "minimum" of 1400 residential dwellings and this should be reflected in Policy 2.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP148	R Flounders	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	Policy 2 follows through from Table 6 and identifies 853 dwellings to be distributed to Retford. The table in policy 2 highlights the number of dwellings required in Retford is the lowest number of dwellings proposed to an individual strategy strand. Object to the proposed distribution to Retford. The proposed distribution is not in accordance with the settlement hierarchy as the quantum of dwellings proposed will not support the role and function of Retford as the second largest town in the settlement hierarchy. The proposed distribution is not in accordance with spatial objective 1 which seeks to ensure that towns and villages grow at a rate and scale commensurate to their defined role. The proposed distribution to Retford should be of a similar quantum to the adopted Core Strategy proportion of 26%. The current proportion is half of the adopted figure. A reduced level of growth would not support the role and function of Retford as the second largest town in the settlement hierarchy. The distribution table shows that the majority of development will take place in Rural Bassetlaw, with 1,777 dwellings proposed to support the growth of existing villages and 1,000 dwellings to be delivered in the plan period in two new garden villages. In total 2,777 dwellings will be delivered in Rural Bassetlaw, compared to 2,453 dwellings in the two largest and most sustainable towns in the District. This approach cannot be justified, it is not an appropriate strategy in the context of sustainable development or taking into account the reasonable alternative, which is to distribute the majority of new housing to the settlements at the top of the settlement hierarchy. In the context of the proposed approach to identify two new garden villages, it is inappropriate to also distribute significant development to existing villages, as this skews the proposed distribution to villages and away from the towns at the top of the settlement hierarchy despite these being the most sustainable locations for new development. It is maintained the delivery of the new garden villages should form part of the distribution to the rural settlements such that 777 dwellings will be delivered in / adjacent to existing villages and 1,000 dwellings delivered in the new garden villages (1,777 dwellings in total). The 1,000 dwellings proposed to be delivered in the new villages should not be in addition to the proposed distribution to existing villages. This amendment, along with an associated increase in distribution to Retford, would re-balance the settlement hierarchy. No justification is given for the low distribution to Retford in the supporting text to Policy 2 or in relation Table 6 which sets out the percentages proposed for each strand of the spatial strategy. The justification is set out in section 10 of the Draft Plan, which sets out the planned growth for Retford.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP148	R Flounders	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	Table 6 identifies that 13% of the housing requirement will be distributed to Retford, which is identified as a rural-hub town, second in the settlement hierarchy. Worksop as the sub-regional centre will accommodate 24% and Harworth, a local regeneration centre will accommodate 21%. Two new garden villages are proposed which will accommodate 15% of the housing requirement and which is in addition to the 27% distribution proposed to be distributed to rural settlements. In total, 42% of the housing requirement is to be distributed to new and existing villages. Object to the proposed distribution to Retford. The proportion is too low given Retford's position in the settlement hierarchy as the second largest town.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP149	H Godley	Fisher German on behalf of D Thorlby	Note that the standardised methodology is the starting point to calculate the housing requirement. It has then gone on to uplift this in order to ensure there is sufficient workforce to meet the anticipated growth in jobs. This approach is considered positive and entirely justified. If the housing uplift is not made, it could hinder the ability of growing firms to employ staff locally. This could stifle economic growth and even lead to economic decline, with firms moving elsewhere, outside of the District. Wholly endorse the housing requirement. To work out the residual requirement for allocation, the Council first discount existing supply, minus a lapse rate. The application of this lapse rate is supported. Past trends have set out that 1 in 4 permitted dwellings have not been delivered. There is no evidence that this will change - the use of this lapse rate is likely to give a more accurate indication of the forthcoming housing supply, ensuring the Council are in a position to meet all future needs and is supported. Note that the 2018 NPPF definition of deliverable has been used. The Council need to be satisfied that the work done remains consistent with the NPPF 2019, particularly in respect of the updates to the definition of deliverable. The Draft Plan allocates 24% (1,600 dwellings) of the Housing Requirement to Worksop. Of this, 1,316 are commitments, leaving a residual requirement of 284 dwellings to be allocated by the plan. This is in contrast to the Bassetlaw Core Strategy which apportioned 32% of total growth to Worksop. The Plan states that over the period 2011 to 2018 housing delivery has not met housing need in Worksop. Para 9.7 acknowledges this to be 'partly' as a result of the Council not allocating sites for housing during this period. Para 9.8 states that "given the shift in strategy to a more balanced approach, and the fact that Worksop has not met its housing requirement since the Core Strategy was adopted, it is considered appropriate to reduce the town's requirement". Note Worksop has not delivered as much housing as the Core Strategy intended, it has still delivered a significant amount of housing (1,316 dwellings), which would indicate that there is strong demand. In line with the approach of seeking to encourage further employment provision in Worksop, do not believe that any future growth over and above the 1,600 requirement should be prevented. Consider that the town still should be regarded as a very sustainable and well-connected location for development which does benefit from strong levels of demand. Consider Worksop will be able to deliver additional levels of growth if required.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Plan recognises Worksop's role as the main town within the district and apportion the highest level of housing (1600 new homes). This is not intended to be a ceiling and the policies in the plan are considered sufficiently flexible to enable more development where appropriate. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP151	D Kitson	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	The current 5 year housing land supply situation is incorrect. There are numerous anomalies within this document and in a time when we all are charged by central government to produce more homes, it is ironic that a 7.9 year supply would enable the Council to "take its foot off the pedal". Issues surrounding deliverable sites and the true meaning of deliverable, densities of development and unrealistically high build out rates will all be challenged and hopefully resolved. Having said that, there is much in this draft which does support development and so it should. As a district Bassetlaw has much to offer. Its location adjacent to the South Yorkshire cities/towns of Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield make it attractive for people to live and commute and also, with more encouragement, should be able to attract industry that is sometimes relating to other industries in adjacent authorities. Also have Doncaster Sheffield Airport which is a growing asset for the whole area and with increased freight usage, opportunities will arise which should be taken, to attract satellite businesses into Bassetlaw. An attractive district wide "offer" should be published by the Council indicating both urban and rural expansion plans.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Five Year Land Supply statement is based on robust evidence. Officers have liaised with land owners to gain an understanding of the status of each site. Some information is confidential (i.e. pre-application advice) and cannot be published. Based on evidence from past delivery, which is very accurate, the Council is confident that the Five Year Housing Land Supply is sound.
DBLP153	J Neville	The Haworth Group on behalf of Welbeck Colliery	Supportive of the housing distribution proposed. Note that there is no contingency/ buffer in the Housing Land Supply (HLS). The provision of a contingency/ buffer in the planned HLS will allow the Local Plan to respond to changing circumstances, provide market choice and take into account any under delivery over the plan period. If a wider range of allocated housing sites are included in the Plan, it will ensure the delivery of housing growth across short, medium and long terms.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP158	H Godley	Fisher German on behalf of T Strawson and D Horrocks	Noted that the authority has used the standardised methodology as the starting point to calculate its housing requirement. It has then gone on to uplift this to ensure there is sufficient workforce to meet the anticipated growth in jobs. This approach is positive and entirely justified. If the housing uplift is not made, it could hinder the ability of growing firms to employ staff locally. This could stifle economic growth and lead to economic decline, with firms moving elsewhere, outside of the District. Endorse the housing requirement. To work out the residual requirement for allocation, the Council first discount existing supply, minus a lapse rate. The application of this lapse rate is supported. Past trends have set out that 1 in 4 permitted dwellings have not been delivered. There is no evidence that this will change, the use of this lapse rate is likely to give a more accurate indication of the forthcoming housing supply, ensuring the Council are in a position to meet all future needs and is supported. Note that the Council in establishing supply utilised the 2018 NPPF definition of deliverable. The Government published the updated NPPF (2019). The Council need to be satisfied that the work done remains consistent with the NPPF particularly in respect of the updates to the definition of deliverable. The Draft Plan allocates 13% (853 dwellings) of the Housing Requirement to Retford. This is just over half that being proposed for Worksop and Harworth. Of this, 416 are commitments leaving a residual requirement of 437 dwellings to be allocated by the plan. The Draft Plan at 10.6 outlines that Retford as been the recipient of "significant levels of growth since the Core Strategy was adopted in 2011". During the Core Strategy (2011), Retford was allocated 26% of the housing growth total. Whilst continued periods of growth can lead to objections from local people, there is no policy within the NPPF that suggests such growth should be restricted, simply because significant growth has occurred in a locale. In reality, the strong delivery in Retford is likely to be attributable to strong housing need. Consider that Retford remains eminently sustainable, well connected and benefits from strong levels of demand. Retford is able to deliver additional levels of growth if required.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP165	AR Yarwood	National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups	Welcome the commitment set out in Paragraph 6.37 to address the needs of Gypsies and Travellers, in part by a criteria-based policy. Do not accept that the 2015 Bassetlaw Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment provides an adequate basis for determining the scale of that need. Single authority assessments do not meet the NPPF requirement for joint authority working and an already 4-year old assessment will not be sufficiently up-to-date. Without a new assessment, preferably undertaken with neighbouring authorities, the Plan will not be sound or effective.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the GTAA and will update it as necessary.
DBLP162	C Daniels		The plan is a positive step recognising the need for growth in all areas including those rural areas. See no mention of tourism or our visitor economy. Tourism accounts for nearly 10% of the UK's GDP and employs 10% of the workforce, although you do recognize growth in the hotel sector in Bassetlaw, a positive statement for our tourism sector, which is significant, and particularly with the 2020 and beyond Mayflower Pilgrim activity. The main development on new towns just off the A1 for commuters to other areas may not bring much economic advantage to the towns. Will suffer an economic loss without the airport - including its future potential - look at how Doncaster was an old disused airfield. It is losing a transport link.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of employment growth in the future. This will include the visitor economy. The economic capacity and transport potential of the airport is being assessed and will inform the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP169	I Herring	Avant Homes (Central) and Wyndthorpe Developments Ltd	Policy 2 defines the housing requirement of 6,630 dwellings (390 d/pa) across the plan period. In line with the NPPF's thrust of significantly boosting the supply of housing, this should be expressed as a minimum requirement. Refer to the recently issued Inspector's Report for the Newark & Sherwood Amended Core Strategy DPD, noting that the plan requirement should be expressed as a floor and not a ceiling in order to be found sound. Policy 2 seeks a realigned spatial distribution of the housing and economic requirement from the adopted Core Strategy, largely as a result of rebalancing the housing requirement in order to direct 15% of the total quantum of development across the plan period toward the identified new villages. Cumulatively, these are envisaged to deliver a total of 1,000 units by the end of the plan period. The proposed spatial distribution is contrasted with the strategy previously found sound within Policy CS1. The two largest towns of Worksop and Retford have seen significant reductions to the overall distribution of housing from those approved under Policy CS1. In particular, the residual growth to the town of Retford has been slashed by half, from the target of 26% found sound in the adopted Core Strategy to a target of 13% (expressed as being equivalent to 853 dwellings). Despite Harworth containing more limited amenities than Retford (i.e. shops, services, employment & leisure opportunities), the residual target to Harworth is identified at 21% and equivalent to a total of 1,400 dwellings. The Council's position is informed by the adopted Harworth & Bircotes Neighbourhood Plan, which commits to the delivery of the former Harworth colliery site in addition to other sites benefiting from outline planning permission at the time of adoption. Whilst those allocations (or committed sites) identified within a made Neighbourhood Plan should be respected, when such position is translated to the spatial strategy in 'Policy 2', the aim to direct both housing & economic growth to those areas deemed most sustainable is effectively distorted, with the role of the rural-hub town of Retford undermined. Such approach is contrary to the spatial strategy found sound under the adopted Core Strategy, and we refer back to the Inspector's Report following examination where it was stated:- "This overall strategy of steering development to where there are services, facilities and jobs, is consistent with national and regional guidance on the creation of a sustainable pattern of development." An appropriate buffer or contingency within the overall plan requirement could ensure greater distribution toward Retford in order to better rebalance the spatial distribution of the plan requirement.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The NPPF has been reviewed and updated since the Core Strategy was adopted in 2011. It does not require a hierarchy based on the size of each settlement, it requires a more nuanced understanding of the needs of each area of the district. Local Planning Authorities must assess the development needs of their area and formulate a strategy which meets those needs in a sustainable way. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.

DBLP170	M Malcolm	East Markham Parish Council	Of the opinion that the Draft Plan has been driven by housing and that insufficient detailed thought has been given to employment needs. When considering housing numbers, a lot of work has been undertaken assigning numbers to towns or parishes with the larger schemes are marked on plans. The equivalent work doesn't appear to have been undertaken for employment. For example, what are the levels of unemployment for the different areas? What is the average travel to work time for each area? What job numbers are required in the different areas of Bassetlaw over the Plan Period? What are the required job numbers in the District to create zero unemployment? There appears to be a limited ambition in the plan for local employment opportunities, there are no suggestions put forward as to where and how additional employment could arise. Would like to see greater emphasis on employment in the rural areas. East Markham has become a dormitory village with most residents travelling to work. Concerned given the increase in population the parish are about to experience there will be a lack of local employment opportunities in the village, but in the local vicinity, particularly for the young people of the village. Concerns were expressed regarding the inadequacy of public transport the buses do not run seven days a week and they stop too early in the evening. Turning to the wider aspects of the plan we find the numbers regarding housing needs and proposed development to be confusing. On Page 14, 2.4 the Office for National Statistics estimates population growth in Bassetlaw to be 5200 over the plan period. On Page 35, 6.12 Oxford Economics estimate a growth in employment in Bassetlaw of 3400 jobs in the same period. The District Council are however planning to build 6630 this equates to almost 1.3 houses per person rise in population. The NPPF standardised methodology Page 35, 6.7 results in 306 houses per year being required, a total of 5202 for the plan period. The draft plan however proposes to build 390 dwellings per year over the plan period (Page 36 6.13) making a total of 6630. Appear to be proposing this number in the hope that the District will be able to attract more employment to the area, but offer no evidence of the action the Council will take for this to happen. Is there any anticipation that one of the surrounding authorities will fail to meet its housing requirements and will ask the District to absorb the overspill?	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the employment requirements of the district and will make any necessary amendments to the plan.
DBLP172	J Buckwell	dha planning on behalf of Laing O'Rourke	Welcome the commitment to allocating sites across the district for B1, B2 and B8 employment and mixed use development. For the reasons set out in these representations, this should include the allocation of land at EIP for general B1, B2 and B8 employment uses.	Employment land availability is being assessed (and will include Laing O'Rourke site) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP173	J Cox	Lichfields on behalf of SP Scholey and the estate of WA Scholey	Para 6.7 notes that in applying the NPPF Standardised Methodology, there is an objectively assessed need for 306 homes per annum for the Plan period and rightly acknowledges that this is not a housing requirement figure, rather a minimum starting point. Para 6.10 describes how, based on the 2017 SHMA, a housing delivery target of 417 dwellings per annum would be needed if the Council were to adopt a more ambitious economic growth target in the draft Local Plan. More recent economic forecasts however – as described at paras 6.11 and 6.12 – are seen to give rise to a lesser housing requirement of 390 dwellings per annum which is subsequently taken forward as a target within Policy 2. Building on the recognition at para 6.13 that the Council needs to plan for more homes than the minimum standard, consider it wholly appropriate for a more ambitious housing target to be taken forward. This, in turn, would ensure that the Plan has the flexibility to achieve more aspirational economic growth (should market circumstances allow) and also help ensure that much-needed affordable housing is delivered during the Plan period. Welcome – at para 6.15 – the acknowledgement of the need for the Plan to allocate more land for housing than is required; this is essential in terms of its ability to ensure a flexible supply of housing is available during its lifetime. Note that paras 6.20 – 6.23 state that in rural areas, lapsed rates are to be addressed through land allocations that are to be made in emerging and submitted Neighbourhood Plans. This approach is considered to give rise to an inequitable distribution of new housing in the rural areas of Bassetlaw, with the housing supply skewed between those settlements that have (or will have) a Neighbourhood Plan in place and those that do not. The number of Neighbourhood Plans that can be seen to have already stalled on page 43 and also the uncertainty as to whether emerging Neighbourhood Plans will actually include specific land use allocations suggest the emerging Local Plan to be overly reliant on their delivery. Note that footnote 31 of Section 6 should be updated to reflect the definitions of 'deliverable' within the NPPF (as revised in February 2019). Para 6.46 states that to support economic growth, there is a minimum requirement to provide 8 ha (gross) of land for economic development per annum. This is taken forward as a target in Policy 2. Support the aspirations to achieve economic growth beyond the minimal requirement, consider this to be at odds with the level of housing growth that is proposed and, in particular, the growth caps that are proposed for individual settlements.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Despite the fact that there are currently restrictive planning policies in the Core Strategy on development in many rural settlements, there has been a steady delivery of new homes (averaging at 92 dpa) since 2010. This demonstrates strong demand for housing in these areas. Given the proposal to support more development, the housing requirement (which equates to 105 dpa) is considered deliverable over the plan period. Given the direction that the emerging plan provides for neighbourhood plans, it is not expected that they will stall. The Council provides strong support and guidance to neighbourhood plan groups and this is evident in the number currently in progress.
DBLP173	J Cox	Lichfields on behalf of SP Scholey and the estate of WA Scholey	The level of housing growth in Policy 2 should be increased to reflect the aspirational level of economic growth that is set out within the same policy as well as the overarching Vision for the Plan. Para 7.9 acknowledges that there has been persistent underdelivery of affordable housing in Bassetlaw. This provides further justification as to why Policy 2 should be revised to provide a more ambitious housing requirement and, in doing so, ensure that a sufficient supply of deliverable and viable sites are available to provide much-needed affordable housing.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP180	D Gray	Freeths on behalf of Hallam Land	In accordance with PPG, the start date for the calculation of the OAN using the standard methodology is 2018. The housing requirement period aligns with the Local Plan, commencing 2018 and ending 2035. Applying the NPPF Standardised Methodology results in an objectively assessed need for 306 homes per annum for the District for the Plan period. This is the minimum housing need figure which must be planned for, and in accordance with the NPPF this will be reviewed every 5 years. The wider considerations on housing delivery and need from past trends, the 2017 SHMA Update findings, and results of the more up to date 2018 EDNA, it is recognised that the Council needs to plan for more homes than the minimum standard housing results for Bassetlaw. A local plan requirement of 390 dwellings per annum for 2018 – 2035 is appropriate to deliver housing to meet the population and economic growth needs of the district. Following review of deliverable and developable sites, as defined by the NPPF, it is evident that housing needs cannot be met within Bassetlaw without allocating additional sites. Deliverable and developable sites identified (neighbourhood plan allocations and sites with planning permission with a discount applied for the lapsed rate) would support delivery of 3,949 homes. Bassetlaw has acknowledged that to provide choice and flexibility in the housing market, and maintain a five-year housing land supply, that it is necessary to allocate more land for housing than required. This means allocating land to account for lapsed permissions based on past trends. Figure 3: Key Diagram, indicates the distribution and number of dwellings proposed in each area with Workshop requiring to accommodate 24% of the total housing required. This equates to 1600 new dwellings within the plan period 2018 – 2035. This diagram illustrates a shift to providing a significant proportion of new homes to rural Bassetlaw with a proposed distribution of 27% providing a significant proportion of new homes in less sustainable locations. The sustainable edge of town centre location in close proximity to new employment development represents a more sustainable and accessible location reducing the reliance on the private motor vehicle. Land at Peaks Hill Farm North of Workshop would accord with the key aims of Policy 1, in that it would focus new development in and adjoining the largest town in Bassetlaw and would significantly contribute to the delivery of new housing and economic development. Would support the proposed new employment land to the north east.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing land availability and suitability with a view to identifying sites for allocation. The site will be considered through this process.
DBLP192	B Lomas	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	Objectively Assessed Housing Need and Planned Housing Requirement: NPPF (2019) should be referenced in the Local Plan going forward. Barratt Homes have had a longstanding interest in the progress of the Plan. Previous consultation responses have been submitted to earlier documents, and a Housing Need Technical Note has been submitted following the Council's publication of a Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement in October 2018, which suggested a housing need figure of 324 dwellings per annum. Whilst the Council's position in relation to the housing requirement has now changed, the Technical Note remains relevant in the analysis of the SHMA Update (October 2017). Technical Note attached. Supporting text to Policy 2 refers to EDNA it is not clear what the origin of the 306 homes per annum (para 6.7 of the Plan) is, nor is it clear in the EDNA. The EDNA informs that the base population is taken from the 2016-based subnational population projections (SNPP) which have concerns with, given the most recent Government advice (Government response to the technical consultation on updates to national planning policy and guidance February 2019). The latest Government position is that it thinks that the 2016-based household projections should not be used as a reason to justify lower housing need. The PPG is clear that the 2014-based household projections should be used as the baseline 2a-005-20190220. "Why are the 2014-based household projections used as a baseline for the standard method? The 2014-based household projections are used within the standard method to provide stability for planning authorities and communities to ensure that historic under-delivery and declining affordability are reflected, and to be consistent with the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes." The 2014 based Standard Methodology results in a minimum housing need of 324 dwellings per annum and this should remain the minimum starting point, rather than 306 dwellings per annum in the Plan. Using the NPPF methodology, the housing need of 324 dwellings per annum is based on the 2014 Sub National Household Projections (SNHP) and 2017 affordability ratio of 5.8. This figure increases to 329 dwellings per annum based on the 2014 SNHP and 2018 affordability ratio of 6.04 in accordance with the methodology set out in the revised PPG (February 2019). Further explanation is required to the Council's derivation of the 306 dwelling per annum figure contained in the Plan. Support the Council's acknowledgment that the Standard Methodology is the minimum housing need figure and welcome the recognition that the Council needs to plan for more homes than the minimum standard housing results. The PPG (paragraph 10 ref 2a-010-20190220) is clear that in supporting the government's ambitions to ensure that more homes are built it will be appropriate to assess whether the actual housing need is higher than the standard method indicates taking into account economic circumstances or other factors such as demographic behaviour and migration trends. Support the recognition that an uplift to the standard method is appropriate, question the quantum of the uplift to 390 dwellings per annum, particularly considering the findings of the SHMA Update (October 2017) which result in a 'growth scenario' need of 417 dwellings per annum, and an annual need of 670 dwellings in order to deliver affordable housing need in full. Further justification is required of the use of the midpoint Oxford Economics growth scenario resulting in 390 homes per annum, as opposed to the Cambridge Economics or Experian midpoint growth scenarios which result in higher annual requirements of 493 and 456 homes. Further justification would be welcome as to why a midpoint was taken, rather than a High Growth scenario which would result in annual dwelling requirements of 608, 555 and 518 (Table 16 EDNA). A further understanding of the minimum starting point and the quantum of uplift would be welcomed, and this should be clearly set out in the justifying text.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The current year should be used as the starting point for calculating the housing need. This results in a requirement for 306 dpa. The 324 dpa has a base date of 2016 and is out of date for the purpose of plan making.
DBLP192	B Lomas	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	Support the Council's acknowledgment of the necessity to allocate more land for housing than required (para 6.15). Does not appear to have been taken on board fully in the residual housing requirement. Whilst the Council have included a lapse rate for small and large sites with permission in the calculation of the residual housing requirement there is no additional contingency to account for treating the housing requirement as a minimum target, and to provide flexibility, choice and competition in the market. An additional contingency should be included. The HBF recommend as large a contingency as possible and suggest at least 20%. This replicated a level of contingency that was recommended by the Local Plans Expert Group. Table 6 – Distribution of housing requirement: acknowledge the spatial strategy strands in Section 5 of the Plan. The spatial strategy has a bearing on the distribution of the housing requirement in Section 6 Policy 2, and it would be helpful if justifying text was included in Section 6 which explains the distribution. What is not clear is how the percentage requirements to each 'strand' have been assigned. Support the identification of Harworth as a Local Regeneration Centre and are keen to deliver much needed housing in Harworth which will assist in the regeneration of the town. In supporting the regeneration of Harworth, it is considered that the distribution of the housing requirement should be increased to include a higher proportion to Harworth. The Plan currently proposes 21% of the housing requirement to Harworth, yet the collective rural settlements receive the highest proportion in the District with 27% of the total requirement. Concerned that the Plan distributes too much development to these lower order settlements at the expense of higher order sustainable settlements such as Harworth. The over emphasis to the rural settlements potentially risks the regeneration success of Harworth. Reconsideration of the distribution of the housing requirement is requested. Lifting Harworth to the second tier- the distribution of dwellings should reflect this. As a minimum a distribution of 26% towards Harworth is considered to be appropriate in order for the settlement to fulfil its role as a Local Regeneration Centre.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP193	R Bowen	White Young Green on behalf of Stadium Development	The number of homes proposed to be delivered in the Draft Local Plan (6,630 dwellings in total / 390 dwellings per annum) of which a minimum of 1,000 units are to be delivered at the two Garden is supported, with the balance of the total 4,000 dwellings delivered after the plan period.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP195	J Beverley	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of The Holy and Undivided Trinity	Note that the authority has used the standardised methodology as the starting point to calculate it housing requirement, utilising the 2014 housing projections in line with national guidance. It has gone on to uplift this to ensure there is sufficient workforce to meet the anticipated growth in jobs; this approach is considered to be positive and justified. If the housing uplift was not made, it could hinder the ability of growing firms to employ staff locally and stifle economic growth, with businesses moving elsewhere to find suitable levels of labour. Wholly endorse the housing requirement. To work out the residual requirement for allocation, the Council first discount existing supply, minus a lapse rate. The application of this lapse rate is supported. Past trends have set out that 1 in 4 permitted dwellings approved have not been delivered. There is no evidence that this will change. The use of this lapse rate is therefore likely to give a more accurate indication of the level of housing supply, ensuring the Council are in a position to meet all future needs. This method is supported. Note that in establishing levels of housing supply utilised the 2018 NPPF definition of deliverable. Since the publication of the Draft, the Government published the updated NPPF (2019). The Council should be satisfied that the work done today remains consistent with the NPPF, particularly with the updates to the definition of deliverable. The Draft Plan allocates 13% (853 dwellings) of the Housing Requirement to Retford. This is half that being proposed for Worksoop and Harworth respectively. Of this, 416 are commitments leaving a residual requirement of 437 dwellings to be allocated by the plan. Note that the Core Strategy (2011), allocated 26% of the total housing requirement for Bassetlaw to Retford. Whilst it is recognised that Retford has been the recipient of "significant levels of growth since the Core Strategy was adopted in 2011" (para 10.6 of the Plan) and that continued periods of growth can lead to objections from local people, there is no policy in the Framework that suggests growth should be restricted or limited, simply because significant growth has occurred. Actual delivery in Retford was only 20% above that set out in the Core Strategy. This overprovision cannot justify the 50% reduction proposed by the emerging plan. The strong delivery in Retford is likely to be attributable to strong housing need. Consider that Retford remains an extremely sustainable and well-connected town and benefits from strong levels of demand. Retford is able to deliver additional levels of growth above that currently proposed by the Draft Plan. Directing only 13% of the total housing requirement to Retford fails to take into account its role as set out in the Spatial Strand. The number of dwellings distributed to Retford should therefore be increased to better reflect the likely housing need and sustainability of the settlement.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to ensure that the Bassetlaw Plan accords with the most up to date NPPF. The Council is currently reviewing the Spatial Strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP195	J Beverley	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of The Holy and Undivided Trinity	The level of employment land is supported. It is an ambitious, yet deliverable target reflecting latest employment projections. Support the Council's increase in housing requirement to ensure that there is a suitable workforce to support the planned economic growth. The land at North Road, Retford can deliver a minimum of 8.5ha of employment land, 6% of the Districts total. This will make a valuable contribution to the employment requirement, adjacent to a successful employment development at Trinity Park, north of Randall Way. The site currently benefits from a resolution to grant outline consent for up to 11.11ha of employment land, whilst this remains a fall-back position. Having regard to the NPPF (2019), there is an opportunity to allocate a differing amount of development, to make best use of the land. Consider the site to be suitable to deliver in the region of the below parameters; • Between 300 dwellings at 30dph and 11.5ha of employment land. • Between 400 dwellings at 30dph and 8.5ha of employment land. Having regard to the imminent signing of the S106, it is prudent to allocate this site as a commitment with land to the north also allocated as Phase 2 of the wider scheme.	Employment land availability is being assessed (and will include North Road Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP196	S Williams	Savills on behalf of landowners of Upper Morton, Babworth	Support the approach to "the rurals" in respect of the two garden villages. The Council have recognised that the OAN figure set out by DCLG is a baseline figure and through incorporating the results of the 2018 EDNA it has been emphasised that an uplift from the standardised OAN was needed. The new villages are an important element of Bassetlaw's long term spatial strategy, and will deliver a significant amount of housing development over the plan period as well as contributing to the longer term aspirations of Bassetlaw. It is envisaged that this growth will help to meet a proportion of the needs of the local housing market in Retford. The new villages represent a large proportion of the 6,630 dwellings required between 2018 to 2035. Development in Bassetlaw is restricted due to the 300 Local Wildlife Sites and 10,000 hectares of woodland, which is nearly double the average woodland cover within an English district. The population of Bassetlaw are also concentrated to the main towns Worksoop, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes. These built up areas cannot accommodate all the growth and it is seen as necessary to build two new villages which allow for Bassetlaw to succeed in the housing need figures. The new villages will represent 15% of the district's housing requirement, providing approximately 1,777 dwellings over the plan period, making a significant contribution to the plan's success. The new villages also represent wider opportunities, including services, facilities and employment opportunities to deliver net environmental gains. The two villages are in line with the Garden City principles as well as incorporating the three principles of sustainable development as set out in NPPF (para 8). It is considered that this emerging approach is sound and we note the ability of the land to complement and drive supporting employment opportunities in this area to the south of the district. In conjunction with an aspirational housing figure it is vital that the Bassetlaw Local Plan also provides employment space to meet the growing demands of the region and achieve the economic growth aspirations of Bassetlaw. The District already benefits from good connections to the Sheffield City Region, the A1 and M1, and East Coast Mainline representing a key opportunity for employment and economic growth. The EDNA indicates that there is a requirement to deliver 136 Hectares of employment land across the District. Argue this is a baseline and that given the excellent connections, the Plan could be more ambitious. The land at Upper Morton will make a significant contribution to the overall land required over the plan period. The site will allow the delivery of new enterprises with floorplates of a size to attract national and international businesses as well as the expansion of existing businesses, providing a range of goods jobs across urban and rural Bassetlaw. The site is well connected to the two main towns of the region, Retford and Worksoop, and is in close proximity to the Garden Villages which will allow the development to respond to local needs and opportunities to increase the overall employment attraction of the Bassetlaw District. The site is also well located along the A1 corridor which has been recognised as an emerging market for employment, following projects at Blyth, and looks to serve a sub-regional market for distribution and industrial land. The site represents a key long term solution to meet anticipated trends as well as current trends.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The new villages are identified as being capable of delivering 1000 new dwellings within the plan period (not 1777 dwellings). The rural settlements are proposed to deliver 1777 dwellings.
DBLP198	S Trough	Pegasus Planning on behalf of Sunnyside Dairy Farms Limited	Whilst the commitment to delivering a level of housing provision above the standard methodology is welcomed, the justification for the proposed level of provision is not sufficiently clear. Unclear whether the Council, working with adjoining authorities has identified any unmet need that would need to be addressed in the local Plan. There needs to be further clarification of level of housing provision that the Council intends to plan for. Whatever figure is identified, this should be expressed as a minimum requirement and Policy 2 should be amended to make clear that the overall provision and distribution to settlements represent minimum requirements. The Draft Plan does not include a housing trajectory and it is not clear how the Council intends to maintain a five year supply of housing in accordance with the NPPF. If housing allocations are to be identified through a Part 2 Plan, there is a risk that there may be delays in bringing sites forward. The plan needs to enable the early release of suitable and sustainable small scale sites to support housing delivery in advance of the Part 2 Plan. Policy 2 proposes that 10% of the overall housing requirement for the District will be delivered on sites of 1 hectare or less. This approach is supported. A wide range of sites will provide access to suitable land for a range of housebuilders; from small local companies to larger regional and national companies, which in turn offers a wide range of house types in order to meet housing needs across the District. The site at Normanton on Trent falls into this category. The 2019 NPPF at paragraph 68 notes the important contribution small and medium sites can make to meeting the housing requirements of an area and notes that these sites are often built-out quickly. At a) it is noted that local planning authorities should identify though the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than 1 hectare.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The next draft plan will provide further clarification.
DBLP199	S Williams	Savills on behalf of landowners of Top Farm south, Elkesley	Support the approach to "the rurals" in respect of the two garden villages. The Council have recognised that the OAN figure set out by DCLG is a baseline figure and through incorporating the results of the 2018 EDNA it has been emphasised that an uplift from the standardised OAN was needed. The new villages are an important element of Bassetlaw's long term spatial strategy, and will deliver a significant amount of housing development over the plan period as well as contributing to the longer term aspirations of Bassetlaw. It is envisaged that this growth will help to meet a proportion of the needs of the local housing market in Retford. The new villages represent a large proportion of the 6,630 dwellings required between 2018 to 2035. Development in Bassetlaw is restricted due to the 300 Local Wildlife Sites and 10,000 hectares of woodland, which is nearly double the average woodland cover within an English district. The population of Bassetlaw are also concentrated to the main towns Worksoop, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes. These built up areas cannot accommodate all the growth and it is seen as necessary to build two new villages which allow for Bassetlaw to succeed in the housing need figures. The new villages will represent 15% of the district's housing requirement, providing approximately 1,777 dwellings over the plan period, making a significant contribution to the plan's success. The new villages also represent wider opportunities, including services, facilities and employment opportunities to deliver net environmental gains. The two villages are in line with the Garden City principles as well as incorporating the three principles of sustainable development as set out in NPPF (para 8). It is considered that this emerging approach is sound and we note the ability of the land to complement and drive supporting employment opportunities in this area to the south of the district. In conjunction with an aspirational housing figure it is vital that the Bassetlaw Local Plan also provides employment space to meet the growing demands of the region and achieve the economic growth aspirations of Bassetlaw. The District already benefits from good connections to the Sheffield City Region, the A1 and M1, and East Coast Mainline representing a key opportunity for employment and economic growth. The EDNA indicates that there is a requirement to deliver 136 Hectares of employment land across the District. Argue this is a baseline and that given the excellent connections, the Plan could be more ambitious. The land at Elkesley will make a significant contribution to the overall land required over the plan period. The site will allow the delivery of new enterprises with medium to smaller scale floorplates, providing a range of goods jobs across urban and rural Bassetlaw. The site is well connected to the two main towns of the region, Retford and Worksoop, and is in close proximity to the Garden Villages which will allow the development to respond to local needs and opportunities to increase the overall employment attraction of the Bassetlaw District. The site is also well located along the A1 corridor which has been recognised as an emerging market for employment, following projects at Blyth, and looks to serve a sub-regional market for distribution and industrial land. The site represents a key long term solution to meet anticipated trends as well as current trends.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The new villages are identified as being capable of delivering 1000 new dwellings within the plan period (not 1777 dwellings). The rural settlements are proposed to deliver 1777 dwellings.
DBLP201	T Beavin	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of the Kilner Estate	The plan proposes to deliver 390 dwellings per annum based on the latest calculation of housing needs. This will result in an overall requirement of 6,630 dwellings over the plan period. The balance of housing that needs to be identified after completions commitments etc. is some 2,6821 new allocations. These are proposed to be split between Worksoop, Retford & Harworth the rural areas and two new settlements. Two new settlements are proposed to deliver 1000 homes in the Plan period and another 3000 beyond that date. Do not consider that two new settlements on brownfield sites will deliver 1000 new homes in the Plan Period. The values in Bassetlaw and the infrastructure costs of setting up new settlements are likely to be prohibitive to this kind of approach, when combined with the CIL levy, this will not be a successful strategy. A more appropriate response would be to apportion more dwellings to be found in the rural areas in the named villages within the List in Figure 8. If the 1000 dwellings to be found in new settlements were added to the residual requirement in the rural areas this would give a total of 1438 dwellings to be found in those settlements over the plan period, which is a realistic and deliverable level of growth and development for the rural areas. This type of approach will have the benefit of maximising the existing infrastructure already available in the villages and mean that sites will be able to come forward without serious time delays and offer smaller sites to the local market which are of a scale attractive to local developers. It will enable the delivery of affordable homes in villages if the sites are of a modest scale enabling the organic growth of villages and the provision of local and affordable dwellings. It will also allow for a range of house types to be delivered which will enable existing residents to trade up to larger dwellings or seek an alternative type of accommodation to suit their needs. Support the development of small sites in Ranskill and Torworth where land is available to meet the type of housing needs. Support the general concept of development in the rural areas and that of the interconnected villages as part of the interconnected spatial strategy. This is an appropriate way of dealing with development in the villages and making efficient use of the social and economic resources available in the settlement strings that are identified. Consider more can be made of this approach by the inclusion of additional housing numbers to the interconnected villages and the deletion of the two new villages currently under consideration.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.

DBLP202	T Beavin	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of the Hemerston Estate	The plan proposes to deliver 390 dwellings per annum based on the latest calculation of housing needs. This will result in an overall requirement of 6,630 dwellings over the plan period. The balance of housing that needs to be identified after completions commitments etc. is some 2,6821 new allocations. These are proposed to be split between Worksoop, Retford & Harworth the rural areas and two new settlements. Two new settlements are proposed to deliver 1000 homes in the Plan period and another 3000 beyond that date. Do not consider that two new settlements on brownfield sites will deliver 1000 new homes in the Plan Period. The values in Bassetlaw and the infrastructure costs of setting up new settlements are likely to be prohibitive to this kind of approach, when combined with the CIL levy, this will not be a successful strategy. A more appropriate response would be to apportion more dwellings to be found in the rural areas in the named villages within the List in Figure 8. If the 1000 dwellings to be found in new settlements were added to the residual requirement in the rural areas this would give a total of 1438 dwellings to be found in those settlements over the plan period, which is a realistic and deliverable level of growth and development for the rural areas. This type of approach will have the benefit of maximising the existing infrastructure already available in the villages and mean that sites will be able to come forward without serious time delays and offer smaller sites to the local market which are of a scale attractive to local developers. It will enable the delivery of affordable homes in villages if the sites are of a modest scale enabling the organic growth of villages and the provision of local and affordable dwellings. It will also allow for a range of house types to be delivered which will enable existing residents to trade up to larger dwellings or seek an alternative type of accommodation to suit their needs. Support the development of small sites in Oldcotes where land is available to meet the type of housing needs. support the general concept of development in the rural areas and that of the interconnected villages as part of the interconnected spatial strategy. This is an appropriate way of dealing with development in the villages and making efficient use of the social and economic resources available in the settlement strings that are identified. Consider more can be made of this approach by the inclusion of additional housing numbers to the interconnected villages and the deletion of the two new villages currently under consideration.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP204	D Henson	iba planning on behalf of Carlton Forest Group	The Strategic Plan as now drafted increases the annual housing requirement (which is supported), but lowers the proportion of new housing to be provided in and adjoining Worksoop – instead seeking to redistribute amongst the District’s rural settlements and the two proposed new villages. Object to the Council’s approach in the Spatial Strategy on grounds that Worksoop is the principal and most sustainable settlement in the District where the majority of new housing and employment development should be focused. By reducing the amount of housing to be directed towards Worksoop, the residual housing requirement to be met by housing allocations over the remainder of the Plan period is a nominal 284 dwellings – hardly reflective of the Council’s planned approach in paragraph 9.6 to support “significant levels of housing development and growth across Worksoop through planned site allocations, urban intensification and organic growth”. Wishes the proportion of housing to be directed towards Worksoop to return to a minimum of 32% (as in the adopted Core Strategy) and considers the increased housing numbers will play a pivotal role in contributing towards the delivery of essential infrastructure (physical and social) improvements, via associated S106 contributions and CIL payments. The Council will be aware that my client has invested significantly in securing additional housing and employment development in the town along Blyth Road – and has adopted an extremely pragmatic approach with the housing developer to ensure the early delivery of housing on the site to help contribute towards the Council’s housing supply.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP194	H Leggett	Emery Planning on behalf of J G Pears Property Ltd	Welcome the fact housing, and employment targets set out in Section 6 are identified as minimums. Welcome para 6.46 that it is anticipated that a proportion of the employment land requirement will involve the re-use of existing and vacant, former employment land. The Former High Marnham Power Station is one such site and should be allocated accordingly in the Part 2 Plan. Support the acknowledgement at para 6.48 that in addition to sites that will be allocated for B1, B2 and B8 employment and mixed use development that other employment sites will come forward within the Plan period. The Council’s ‘flexible’ approach to responding to the demands of the market as they arise is welcomed.	Support for the approach to employment targets welcome. Employment land availability is being assessed (and will include the Former High Marnham Power Station) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP207	M. Braithwaite	Robert Doughty Consultancy on behalf of J. Travis	Support Table 7 which sets out the range of quantum of development that will be supported in each settlement. This approach is in general accordance with paragraph 65 of the NPPF, which requires development plans to set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood planning areas. We are not clear, however, how the process for setting the targets for each settlement has been derived. We understand that the minimum Growth Target is equivalent to 10% of dwellings in the settlement at the start of the plan period, and the cap is set at 20% growth, but we do not understand why growth rates have been selected.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP205	H Godley	Fisher German on behalf of P Hinds	Note that the authority has used the standardised methodology as the starting point to calculate its housing requirement. It has then gone on to uplift this in order to ensure there is a sufficient workforce to meet the anticipated growth in jobs. This approach is positive and entirely justified. If the housing uplift was not made, it could hinder the ability of growing firms to employ staff locally. This could stifle economic growth and lead to economic decline, with firms moving elsewhere, outside of the District. Wholly endorse the housing requirement. To work out the residual requirement for allocation, the Council first discount existing supply, minus a lapse rate. The application of this lapse rate is supported. Past trends have set out that 1 in 4 permitted dwellings have not been delivered. There is no evidence that this will change, the use of this lapse rate is likely to give a more accurate indication of the forthcoming housing supply, ensuring the Council are in a position to meet all future needs and as such is supported. Note that in establishing supply the Council utilised the 2018 NPPF definition of deliverable. Since the publication of the Plan, the Government published the updated NPPF (2019). The Council need be satisfied that the work done today remains consistent with the NPPF, as updated, particularly in respect of the updates to the definition of deliverable. The Plan assigns 27% (1,777 dwellings) of the District’s Housing Requirement to the ‘Rural Settlements’. Of this, 1,339 are commitments/site allocations in Neighbourhood Plans, leaving a residual requirement of 438 dwellings to be allocated by the Plan/Neighbourhood Plans. For Treswell and Cottam a minimum housing requirement of 10 dwellings is identified and a capped growth target of 25 dwellings (20% of existing dwellings) is set out. It is significant that the Referendum Version Treswell and Cottam Neighbourhood Plan has not identified any site allocations for the villages. There is a residual requirement for dwellings in Treswell and Cottam which the Bassetlaw Plan should allocate land for.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to ensure that the Bassetlaw Plan accords with the most up to date NPPF. The Council is currently reviewing the Spatial Strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP208	S Weston	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	Do not support. Not really. No not really at all. Do it another way. Saying that the council “will deliver” doesn’t make it super. Fix the problem, not the symptom. We have not got enough housing. So where is everyone living then? Are they homeless? Some are I am sure. Build a massive drop in centre for the homeless. Clean beds, showers, mental health facilities, education facilities and ongoing support through rehabilitation back into society. That should help the homeless. As for the rest, where are they currently living? Renting, they are renting. We have enough buildings, we just can’t buy them. Tax on second and third homes. Huge taxes. Stop people wanting to buy cheap homes and rent them to people who can’t afford to buy the houses because they are paying all of their money to other people who own their homes. This is the problem. Fix this. Alternatively, exacerbate the problem and build more buildings that can be rented to people who can’t afford to buy.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP208	S Weston	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	Do not support. By closing the airport, you will force the company that I work for to move out of Bassetlaw. Will have to move my family. Do not support the amount of employment land. Am not a lorry driver, a warehouse worker, nor do I wish to work in a chip shop. Like my job working for a worldwide flight inspection company providing a service to private airport owners, governments, and militaries in more than 60 countries. Without a runway, those 136 hectares aren’t going to help me or more than 100 other people forced out of the area. Also, land does not make employment. Except for farmers. But then how many of those hectares are currently farmland? You’ll be getting rid of that of course! Maybe I could start my own company doing something else as high tech as what I do now. Will you provide me with the capital to build my own startup premises? If I spend the next 5 years raising that capital on my own, will I then have to compete with Wilkinsons/Tesco for a little corner of the 136 hectares you are turning over to wasteland. Will I have to dig a cesspit?	It is acknowledged that should Retford Gamston Airport close some aviation businesses may have to relocate out of the District. However, the proposal also includes the provision of employment development. In addition employment land will be promoted elsewhere in the District. The intention is that this will provide for a range of jobs to meet the needs of the District. Wherever possible the development of high quality agricultural land will be resisted.
DBLP210	C. Challenger	Lound Parish Council	Broad support for the context of the plan, but have concerns in relation to the 20% cap being detailed in respect of the housing requirement allocation. We question the need for having a target housing requirement (a) followed by a further capped growth figure (b) and view that this additional number (b) could be potentially seen as a means for exploitation by housing developers to force additional housing into areas not necessarily equipped for such a substantial additional growth. We would like to suggest that, instead of the proposed fixed percentage 20% Cap, each Neighbourhood should, using the BDC Requirement as a target, be given the flexibility to plan for a higher level of development that is appropriate for its area and infrastructure, based on a location referendum included within each neighbourhood plan.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The cap is proposed as a safeguard for all rural settlements, seeking to prevent unsustainable patterns of growth. The Council is currently reviewing this policy and will make amendments if considered necessary.
DBLP217	S Hayle	Axis ped on behalf of FCC Environment	Support the provision of 136 hectares of employment land across the district. Figure 3 sets out that 13% (18 hectares) of this will be provided within the rural settlements and 33% (45 hectares) is to be provided within Worksoop. Supported that this is a minimum figure and that it is expected that other sites will come forward within the plan period, this is in accordance with the NPPF which seeks to boost economic growth.	Support for the approach to employment targets welcome. The figures are a minimum which is intended to provide flexibility in delivery moving forward.
DBLP218	E Ridley	Pegasus Planning on behalf of E Fisher and Company Limited	The housing requirement is 390 dwellings per annum (between 2018 to 2035). The Council states that this is appropriate to deliver housing to meet the population and economic growth needs of the district. Acknowledged that requirement is higher than the standard methodology requirement for Bassetlaw (306 dwellings per annum), the Council have been overly cautious in arriving at this figure. The standard methodology identified the minimum number of homes to be planned and does not consider the impact that future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors might have on demographic behaviour. On this basis, welcome consideration given to economic growth scenarios in the EDNA. The Plan argues that the midpoint growth scenario provides the most balanced reflection of Bassetlaw’s economy and is appropriate to deliver housing to meet the population and economic growth needs of the District. This is an overly cautious approach when considering the standard methodology: 1. In addition to looking at future growth in Bassetlaw, the EDNA analyses historical employment trends in the District. Notes that between 2004 and 2017, employment in Bassetlaw increased by 21.0%. This was significantly higher than the 11.0% recorded at a UL level (Figure 40, EDNA Part 1). The 3,400 jobs resulting from the Oxford Economic midpoint growth scenario over the period 2018-2035 translates into total growth of 6.1% (or 0.3% per annum). This represents a slightly longer timeframe than the analysis of previous change (17 years versus 13 years), a jobs growth figure of only 6.1% (0.3% per annum) seems relatively low when considering how well the District has performed historically. 2. Bassetlaw is part of two Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP) areas, one of which is the Sheffield City Region LEP. As part of a refresh of its Strategic Economic Plan, a series of target metrics have been developed. One of which is for the Sheffield City Region to achieve annual jobs growth of 1.0%. Considered that Bassetlaw should be showing the same level of ambition for growth in its labour market, well above the 0.3% per annum opted for in the Local Plan. Conclude that the annual need for housing will need to be moved towards the higher end of the 308-608 detailed within the nine EDNA forecasts. An increase in housing numbers in the District will help ensure that supply is able to meet demand – especially from younger adult households that form and/or may move into the area. There is a risk that the Plan is underestimating the future growth prospects of Bassetlaw, which will hinder the District’s long-term economic competitiveness. The proposed strategy is not positively prepared and justified as it does not provide for the most appropriate strategy for the delivery of housing across the Local Plan period.	At the present time, the housing requirement is considered to be sound based on the evidence from the Bassetlaw EDNA. The Council will review the housing requirement as and when required, taking into consideration any future changes to national planning policy and guidance.

DBLP219	C Jesson	Planning and Design Group on behalf of the Welbeck Estates Company Ltd	Currently, the Council's approach to calculating housing requirement is, on balance, considered appropriate given the shift toward the standardised methodology for calculating a minimum housing requirement in the NPPF. This is in addition to a modest uplift to account for economic growth. Any future updates the standardised methodology will still need be actioned by the Council appropriately and it is expected that strategic policies (as drafted in the emerging Bassetlaw Plan) will require updating at least every five years. The standardised methodology, a minimum requirement of 306 homes per annum has been identified. However, a hybrid target (accounting for past trends/economic aspiration) proposes a target of 390 dwellings per annum. Totalling 6,630 dwellings between 2018 and 2035. This represents a slight uplift on the annual target of 350 dwellings per annum presented in the 2011 Core Strategy, and the 2017 SHMA target of 374 dwellings per annum. Policy wording on all housing figures and delivery should use the term 'at least' when describing a quantum of development implying the figure is a minimum, this in order to ensure that the policy is sound and positively prepared in-line with the NPPF. When calculating the housing trajectory explicit consideration needs to be given to the NPPF's revised definition of 'deliverable'. Any site that falls under the above definition will need to be robustly addressed and evidenced by the Council where it is to support Local Plan assumptions. The 2017 LAA is in a summary only, with no indication of landowner or developer discussions that may support the relative ability of land to be delivered or developed. The assumption that there is currently enough land in the District to support the delivery of 3,949 homes (seemingly including all land with planning permission in Table 5) needs to be explained in more detail. Without this, the current assumptions are unsound. To ensure a flexible supply of land for housing, proposes a distinct rural and local housing requirement, which is capped at 20% growth per settlement (measured against existing dwellings as of August 2018). To meet the requirement for 10% of housing to be delivered on sites of 1 hectare or less the Council will need to make land allocations in rural areas through Neighbourhood Plans and the Plan. The positive approach toward Neighbourhood Plans is welcomed. It is clear from the strategy of that Neighbourhood Plans will play a critical role in delivering future rural housing.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to ensure that the Plan accords with the NPPF and PPG. The next draft Plan will include site allocations. A detailed evidence base is being produced to support this aspect of the Plan.
DBLP221	B Weedall	Gladman Developments	Applying the NPPF Standardised methodology based on 2014-Household Projections results in an objectively assessed need of 306 dwellings per annum over the plan period. Support the Council recognises the need to deliver housing to meet the population and economic growth needs of the district and that the evidence concludes that an uplift against the 2014 Household Projections is required in order to align with the economic growth requirements. The addition of 84dpa annum exceeds the minimum starting point identified through the standard method and will help to secure the employment and affordability needs of Bassetlaw. It is important that this uplift is explained and supported by appropriate technical evidence. In terms of the housing supply analysis, consider that this might be better included as a supporting Topic Paper(s), rather than for it all to be set out in some detail in the Plan. A Neighbourhood Plans Topic Paper may be a more appropriate place to appreciate the contribution of housing from Neighbourhood Plans and a simple table would then suffice (with a cross reference to the topic paper) as part of the Plan. Policy 2 would benefit from a modification which makes clear that the housing requirement of 6,630 is considered as a 'minima' in rather than being a target to be achieved. Reference to the housing requirement being a minimum is supported elsewhere in the Plan and this change could be made via minor modification. As the housing requirement is considered as a 'minimum' this should be reflected in the housing requirements across the settlement hierarchy to ensure that sustainable growth opportunities are able to come forward so that the Plan can react positively to changes in circumstance which may arise over the plan period. Noted that the New Villages are expected to deliver 1,000 dwellings over the plan period with a further 3,000 dwellings post plan period. This is prudent and ensures the long-term development needs of the district are met through large scale development to help improve Bassetlaw's role in the surrounding HMA. Noted that other allocations will be made through the next Plan. Should ensure that the Plan identifies sufficient land across a range of settlements to ensure a flexible and responsive supply of housing land is available to meet local communities housing needs over the short-medium term whilst the necessary infrastructure is put in place in the New Settlements. In time, there can be a cross reference as part of the Policy 2 to the allocations made in addition to current commitments that together will achieve these targets.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to ensure that the Plan accords with the NPPF and PPG. The next draft Plan will include site allocations. A detailed evidence base is being produced to support this aspect of the Plan.
DBLP215	M. Lynam	Sheffield City Region	Generally supportive, and notes the aspirations align with the LEP's Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). Supportive of the proposals for economic growth and recognises, in a positive light, that the proposed delivery of 8ha of employment land per year is above several of the forecasts in the EDNA. "Planning to deliver employment land at the higher end of your future growth scenarios, combined with a strategy that exploits regional and sub regional assets, demonstrates the ambition for new development in Bassetlaw and the role it can continue to play in the wider SCR economy". Also supportive of proposals for growth along the A1 corridor, which aligns with the LEP's identification of this as a key growth area for the City Region, and thus keen to continue to work together to develop these proposals. Equally supportive of proposals for housing growth, including the garden villages - and recognises in a positive light that growth projections are above and beyond local housing need calculations, in line with the aspirations of the LEP.	Support for the approach to employment targets welcome. The Council will continue under the Duty to Cooperate requirements to work with the Sheffield City Region and the LEP to develop relevant proposals. Acknowledgement that housing growth is in line with LEP aspirations, is welcome.
DBLP223	P Stone	Stone Planning Services on behalf of the Charterpoint Group	Paragraph 6.46 states that based on the EDNA a minimum of 136 ha gross are required over the Plan period. Employment being defined as B1, B2 and B8 uses. There is no factor for associated employment uses such as hotels, roadside facilities etc.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. This will include employment related development.
DBLP226	B Barnett	Retford Civic Society	No objection in principle to the target for housebuilding being greater than strictly necessary to reflect expected economic growth but the distribution of this additional housing should reflect where growth in employment is realistically expected. It is not clear from the plan how the housing requirement has been distributed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP229	S Ashton		Supports the number of homes and amount of employment land proposed. Gamston airport could also provide additional employment.	Support for the amount of employmentland proposed noted. Support for provision of additional employment land at Gamston airport noted.
DBLP232	N Oldbury	Elkesley Parish Council	BDC is 7.9 years ahead of its building needs. It is not clear from the figures supplied if this 7.9 figure has been considered when developing this Plan. Would like to see clarity on this.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Yes, the Plan does take this into account. The Plan is a minimum of 15 years timespan. The current housing land supply will not deliver enough housing for the 15 year period. The Council therefore needs to allocate land for housing. The Plan includes information on current supply and residual housing need.
DBLP236	S Rea		When future sites are proposed for allocation within Retford I feel that Retford should not be expanded beyond its current boundaries, and that the plan should include policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond beyond the current boundaries of the town, specifically to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall. However, having looked at the draft plan I do support the proposals for housing expansion in Workop and Harworth.	Housing land availability is being assessed, and will include land submitted for consideration in Retford, which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Support for housing growth in Workop and Harworth noted.
DBLP238	D Owen		Agree with the need for new housing. Any new housing should be constructed away from the town of Retford. The town is almost crippled at certain points in the day due to the already strained road network. The creation of two new villages at the identified sites should be the chosen option.	Housing land availability is being assessed, and will include land submitted for consideration in Retford, which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. As part of this process the Highways Authority will be consulted on the impact on the road network. Support for the garden villages is noted.
DBLP255	S Green	Home Builders Federation	The housing requirement in Policy 2 should be expressed as a minimum figure. The derivation of 390 dwellings per annum is not transparent. The latest OAN is set out in North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw OAN Update Final Report October 2017. This concludes with an OAN in Bassetlaw of 374 dwellings per annum (see Table 92) based on a demographic calculation comprising of 2014 Sub National Population Projections (SNPP) plus adjustments for 10 year migration trends & household formation rates in younger age groups (340 dwellings per annum set out in Table 17) plus an uplift to enhance affordable housing delivery. There is no uplift associated with economic growth as the baseline job growth (2,600 jobs) scenario equals a housing growth of 341 dwellings per annum (see Table 30). As the Council has reset the plan start date at 2018 rather than 2014 it is assumed that housing delivery shortfalls between 2014 – 2018 have been added to the OAN of 374 dwellings per annum between 2014 – 2035 using a Liverpool approach which results in the figure of 390 dwellings per annum. Under the revised NPPG (ID 3-044) if the Council wishes to deal with past under delivery over a longer period than 5 years using a Liverpool rather than Sedgfield approach then this should be considered as part of the Local Plan Examination. It is noted that there may be a disconnection between the Council's proposed housing and economic strategies. The demographic led OAN of 340 dwellings per annum equals the baseline job growth (2,600 jobs) scenario of 341 dwellings per annum but is 77 dwellings per annum less than the 417 dwellings per annum resulting from the jobs-led (4,800 jobs) scenario (see Table 31). The OAN of 374 dwellings per annum after the affordability adjustment is also less than the jobs led scenario by 43 dwellings per annum. The missed opportunity for more housing growth should not harm economic growth ambitions. The 2019 NPPF sets out that overarching economic and social objectives should be pursued in mutually supportive ways to achieve sustainable development (para 8). The positive and proactive encouragement of sustainable economic growth should address potential barriers to investment such as inadequate housing provision (paras 81a & 81c). The Local Plan will be examined under 2019 NPPF and revised NPPG. As set out in the 2019 NPPF the determination of the minimum number of homes needed should be informed by a local housing need assessment using the Government's standard methodology unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach (para 60). Refers to the standard methodology in the revised NPPG (ID 2a-004). Using this methodology the OAN is 324 dwellings per annum based on 2014 Sub National Household Projections (SNHP) & 2017 affordability ratio of 5.8 (see Table 93). This OAN figure increases to 329 dwellings per annum based on 2014 SNHP & 2018 affordability ratio of 6.04 in accordance with the methodology set out in the revised NPPG (ID 2a-004 & 2a-005). This figure is the minimum starting point. Any ambitions to support economic growth, to deliver affordable housing and to meet unmet housing needs from elsewhere are additional to the local housing need figure. The Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes remains (para 59). It is important that housing need is not under-estimated. The Council is encouraged to have an ambitious plan for housing growth in order to support economic growth. At the time of the pre-submission consultation if the Council's OAN calculation or proposed housing requirement change the HBF may wish to submit further comments.	Paragraphs 6.5 to 6.13 of the Bassetlaw Plan set out the method used to determine the housing requirement for the District from 2018 to 2035. G L Hearn reviewed the housing requirement as part of the Economic Development Needs Assessment. This resulted in a housing requirement of 390 dwellings per annum, which is significantly more than the standard method housing need figure of 306 dwellings per annum. With regard to the 306 dpa, the Council considers that this is a minimum requirement. With regard to a contingency to the overall housing land supply, the Council has applied a discount to take into lapsed rates from 2010 onwards. This would result in an over-supply of housing by a minimum of 767 new homes (12% of the housing requirement). Further to this, the Council has not applied a windfall allowance. Windfall sites have historically provided a large percentage of the new homes delivered since 2010 because the Council has not allocated land for housing. The flexibility of local and national planning policies should enable sustainable housing development to continue to come forward on windfall sites.

DBLP255	S Green	Home Builders Federation	As set out in the 2019 NPPF the strategic policies of the Local Plan should provide a clear strategy to bring sufficient land forward and at a sufficient rate to address housing needs over the plan period by planning for and allocating sufficient sites to deliver strategic priorities (para 23). The Council should have a clear understanding of land availability in the plan area by preparing a SHLAA which should be used to identify a sufficient supply and mix of housing sites taking into account availability, suitability and economic viability. The policies of the Local Plan should identify a supply of specific deliverable sites for years 1 – 5 of the plan period and specific developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6 – 10 and where possible years 11 – 15 (para 67). The identification of deliverable and developable sites should accord with the definitions set out in the 2019 NPPF Glossary. The Council should also identify at least 10% of the housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare or else demonstrate strong reasons for not achieving this target (para 68). The Local Plan should include a trajectory illustrating the expected rate of housing delivery over the plan period. A minimum 5 years supply of specific deliverable sites including a buffer should be maintained (paras 73 & 74). The proposed housing requirement will be distributed in accordance with the spatial strategy. It is noted that there is no contingency in the Council's overall HLS. Should provide flexibility in its planned HLS to respond to changing circumstances, to treat the housing requirement as a minimum rather than a maximum and to provide choice and competition in the land market. The HBF acknowledge that there can be no numerical formula to determine the appropriate quantum for a flexibility contingency but where a Plan is highly dependent upon one or relatively few large strategic sites or a specific settlement / locality greater numerical flexibility is necessary than in cases where HLS is more diversified. The HBF suggests as large a contingency as possible (at least 20%) because as any proposed contingency becomes smaller so any built-in flexibility reduces. If during the Local Plan Examination any of the Council's assumptions on lapse rates, windfall allowances and delivery rates are adjusted or any proposed housing site allocations are found unsound then any proposed contingency is eroded.	The methods used to assess the delivery of housing fully accord with the requirements of the NPPF. Housing land supply will continue to be reviewed as necessary.
DBLP255	S Green	Home Builders Federation	Policy 2: Housing and Economic Growth proposes that 10% of the housing requirement will be delivered on sites of 1 hectare or less. A wide range of sites by both size and market locations should provide access to suitable land for small local, medium regional and large national housebuilding companies which will offer the widest possible range of products to households to access different types of dwellings to meet their housing needs. Housing delivery is maximised where a wide mix of sites provides choice for consumers, allows places to grow in sustainable ways and creates opportunities to diversify the construction sector. The HBF would not wish to comment on individual sites selected for allocation but it is critical that the Council's assumptions on lapse rates, non-implementation allowances, lead in times and delivery rates contained within its overall HLS, 5 YHLS and trajectory are correct and realistic. These assumptions should be supported by parties responsible for delivery of housing and sense checked by the Council using historical empirical data and local knowledge. The two new settlements should be considered as part of a wide portfolio of allocated housing sites to ensure delivery of housing growth in the short and longer term. New settlements may address some of the District's housing need but delivery would be towards the end of the Local Plan period. The Council should provide evidence of its 5 YHLS position on adoption of the Local Plan. The HBF's preferences are a 20% buffer applied to the housing requirement and the recouping of past shortfalls within the first 5 years (a Sedgfield approach). If the Council wishes to deal with past under delivery over a longer period than 5 years (a Liverpool approach) then this should be considered as part of the Local Plan Examination as set out in the revised NPPG (ID 3-044).	The Council agrees that the site allocations, where possible, should be a range of sizes to meet the needs of small, medium, and large-scale developers. The land supply calculations are robust because they are based on historical delivery data and close liaison with landowners/developers via the Land Availability Assessment process. The Council is aware of the requirements of the NPPF and will ensure that an up to date 5 year housing land supply statement is published as required.
DBLP258	R Walters	Broadgrove Planning and Development Ltd on behalf of MLN Land and Properties Ltd	Pleased to see a housing target which is higher than the Standard Methodology, do not consider that the target proposed is sufficient to meet housing needs in full and support unconstrained economic growth. The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan proposed a minimum housing requirement of 435 dwellings per annum. The background paper published in support identified that in order to meet the jobs target set by the Strategic Economic Plan for Sheffield, the housing requirement for Bassetlaw would need to be between 554 and 629 dwellings. No explanation has been provided as to why the economic aspirations have reduced so significantly between the Initial Draft of the Local Plan and the current draft of the Local Plan. The Plan states that the target of 390 dwellings per annum reflects an economic-led housing requirement based on an Oxford Economics midpoint forecast of labour demand. The Oxford Economics midpoint forecast has been selected as the preferred expected future economic scenario, it is notably the lowest of the three economic forecasts considered by the EDNA. An economic-led housing requirement based on midpoint growth Experian forecasts equates to a need for 456 dwellings per annum, whilst an economic-led housing requirement based on midpoint growth Cambridge Econometrics forecasts equates to a need for 493 dwellings per annum. An average of the three different midpoint economic-led scenarios considered in the EDNA would equate to a housing requirement of 446 dwellings per annum. Contrary to the aims of the NPPF, adopting a housing requirement of 390 dwellings per annum based on the Oxford Economics midpoint forecast has the potential to restrict growth of the Bassetlaw and Sheffield City Region economies. To meet affordable housing net needs in full, the SHMA (2017) advises an overall housing requirement of 670 dpa. The proposed target of 390 dwellings per annum will fall significantly short of meeting identified affordable housing needs in Bassetlaw. It is clear, based on the available evidence, that the total dwelling requirement set by Policy 2 is not ambitious, will not support unconstrained economic growth, will not significantly boost the supply of housing and will not address identified housing needs. The Draft Plan as proposed is unsound.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The method for calculating the housing requirement accords with the Housing and Economic Need PPG. The Council will ensure that the Plan continues to accord with the NPPF and PPG.
DBLP258	R Walters	Broadgrove Planning and Development Ltd on behalf of MLN Land and Properties Ltd	Strategic Objective 1 states that "Development in Bassetlaw will be distributed across the district, ensuring towns and villages grow at rate and scale commensurate to their defined role." Policy 1 identifies Retford as the second largest town in Bassetlaw, only behind the largest Workop. Figure 1 identifies Retford as being geographically located within the centre of the district and well connected to the district's transport network – Retford is connected to the East Coast Mainline and the Sheffield to Cleethorpes/Lincoln railway line, as well as the A1. It represents one of the most sustainable settlements in the district and plays a vital role in serving the district's rural communities. In of spite it's size, position/role within the district, and its sustainable transport connections, Policy 2 allocates just 13% of the total housing requirement (853 dwellings) to Retford; the smallest requirement of any of the five strands. The NPPF and NPPG do not provide guidance on how housing need should be distributed in a Local Plan. Without such guidance, it is down to the Council to establish a distribution to support the Vision and Objectives of the Local Plan. The resulting distribution will inevitably represent a policy response to meeting identified need, it must be realistic, rational and soundly-based. The level of development in Retford over the 17-year plan period is less than half the number of homes which have been delivered in Retford over the past 10 years – the Council's monitoring data shows that 1,002 homes have been completed in Retford between 2008/09 and 2016/17. It is clear that there is a strong market demand for housing in Retford, as acknowledged by paragraph 10.6. The housing target proposed for Retford does not reflect current market signals. The 2011 Census, the usual resident population of Retford was 22,023, equivalent to 20% of the district population. Of these, 21,742 lived in 9,828 households, with the remainder living in communal establishments. This equates to an average household size of 2.2 persons per household. The households were accommodated in 10,293 dwellings which equates to a vacancy rate of 4.6%. Between 2011 and 2035 the 2014-based household projections suggest that the average household size in Bassetlaw will fall from 2.3 to 2.2 persons per household. Applying the same proportional decrease to the average household size in Retford, the average household size in the town would be 2.1 by 2035. There would be a need to provide an additional 549 dwellings to accommodate an additional 525 households within the existing population alone as people live in smaller household groups (including children moving out of the family home, older people living alone following the death of a partner, increased levels of household breakdown and young people choosing to live alone). The proposed housing requirement of 853 dwellings allows for very limited growth in the population of Retford over the 17-year plan period. Linked to its role as an important infrastructure and service centre for the wider District, the Plan recognises the importance of increasing the viability and vitality of the town centre of Retford. The housing target for Retford will do little more than maintain the status quo in terms of the population size of the town. Contrary to the objectives of the Local Plan, this will be of detriment to the viability of businesses within Retford. Having regard to the size, function and sustainability of Retford, combined with the clear market demand/need for housing in the town, level of housing in Retford is too low. To deliver its Objectives and Vision, the housing proposed to be delivered in Retford must be increased.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make amendments where necessary.
DBLP266	R Walters	Broadgrove Planning and Development Ltd on behalf of MLN Land and Properties Ltd	Pleased to see a housing target which is higher than the Standard Methodology, do not consider that the target proposed is sufficient to meet housing needs in full and support unconstrained economic growth. The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan proposed a minimum housing requirement of 435 dwellings per annum. The background paper published in support identified that in order to meet the jobs target set by the Strategic Economic Plan for Sheffield, the housing requirement for Bassetlaw would need to be between 554 and 629 dwellings. No explanation has been provided as to why the economic aspirations have reduced so significantly between the Initial Draft of the Local Plan and the current draft of the Local Plan. The Plan states that the target of 390 dwellings per annum reflects an economic-led housing requirement based on an Oxford Economics midpoint forecast of labour demand. The Oxford Economics midpoint forecast has been selected as the preferred expected future economic scenario, it is notably the lowest of the three economic forecasts considered by the EDNA. An economic-led housing requirement based on midpoint growth Experian forecasts equates to a need for 456 dwellings per annum, whilst an economic-led housing requirement based on midpoint growth Cambridge Econometrics forecasts equates to a need for 493 dwellings per annum. An average of the three different midpoint economic-led scenarios considered in the EDNA would equate to a housing requirement of 446 dwellings per annum. Contrary to the aims of the NPPF, adopting a housing requirement of 390 dwellings per annum based on the Oxford Economics midpoint forecast has the potential to restrict growth of the Bassetlaw and Sheffield City Region economies. To meet affordable housing net needs in full, the SHMA (2017) advises an overall housing requirement of 670 dpa. The proposed target of 390 dwellings per annum will fall significantly short of meeting identified affordable housing needs in Bassetlaw. It is clear, based on the available evidence, that the total dwelling requirement set by Policy 2 is not ambitious, will not support unconstrained economic growth, will not significantly boost the supply of housing and will not address identified housing needs. The Draft Plan as proposed is unsound.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Bassetlaw EDNA provides evidence which justifies the housing requirement. The assessment accords with the NPPF and Housing and Economic Needs PPG.

DBLP266	R Walters	Broadgrove Planning and Development Ltd on behalf of MLN Land and Properties Ltd	Strategic Objective 1 of the Plan states that "Development in Bassetlaw will be distributed across the district, ensuring towns and villages grow at rate and scale commensurate to their defined role." Policy 1 identifies Harworth and Bircotes as a local regeneration centre, and acknowledgement of the opportunity to focus investment and new development to support the regeneration of Bassetlaw's third largest settlement. Figure 1 identifies Harworth as being geographically located within the north of the district and has excellent connections to South Yorkshire and the A1. It serves an important role for facilities to support a large number of rural villages in the north of Bassetlaw. Despite the focus for regeneration the level of housing is disproportionate to the level of employment land being provided across the district. Figure 3 shows that 28% of the employment land for the district is to be proposed in Harworth and Bircotes but only 21% of the housing. Given the recognition of the plan to strengthen its role as a local infrastructure and service centre for the northeast of the district this brings into question the overall housing target and lack of ambition for economic growth – contradictory to the aims of regenerating the town. There needs to be sufficient housing to accommodate and assist the potential that exists for new economic investment and development. This needs to be increased from the level proposed. The NPPF and NPPG do not provide guidance on how housing need should be distributed in a Local Plan. Without such guidance, it is down to the Council to establish a distribution to support the Vision and Objectives of the Local Plan. The resulting distribution will represent a policy response to meeting identified need, it must be realistic, rational and soundly-based. As proposed, there is a significant disparity of future development across the north and south of the district. 52% of new housing development is proposed across the south of the district (including 2 new villages which are both proposed in the south of the district). If there is a real intent to regenerate Harworth and Bircotes and see a step change of housing delivery there should be greater focus on housing in the north of the district. A more appropriate strategy would be for greater development to be focussed around Harworth and it is questionable why two new villages are proposed to the south of the district. A more appropriate solution would be for a significant increase in growth around Harworth and Bircotes to create another rural hub town of a similar status to Retford in the north of the district. Between 2011 and 2035 the 2014-based household projections suggest that the average household size in Bassetlaw will fall from 2.3 to 2.2 persons per household. Applying the same proportional decrease to the average household size in Harworth, the average household size in the town would be 2.17 by 2035. As a result, would need to provide around 200 additional dwellings to accommodate the additional households within the existing population alone as people live in smaller household groups (including children moving out of the family home, older people living alone following the death of a partner, increased levels of household breakdown and young people choosing to live alone). Linked to its role as an important infrastructure and service centre for the wider District, the Plan recognises the importance of regeneration. The need to see a step change in housing delivery is needed to provide housing numbers but to ensure the delivery of the necessary infrastructure for to assist the economic growth. The delivery of improvements to the transport network, new education provision and other essential local services, as identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will only be realised through significant additional housing growth. Having regard to the regeneration aspirations and economic potential of Harworth and Bircotes, that level of housing to be delivered in Harworth is too low. In order for the plan to deliver its Objectives and Vision, the housing proposed to be delivered in Harworth must be increased.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make amendments where necessary.
DBLP270	D Troop		Page 52 confirms that "there has been persistent under delivery of housing up to year 2015/16. Over the years of the Core Strategy, the annual housing requirement has only been achieved twice (monitoring years 2016/17 and 2017/18" (7.9). New/draft formulae for calculating the 5 year deliverable supply, has enabled Bassetlaw to eradicate the backlog of delivery on account of low affordability ratios. The LPA cannot continue asking for the AH contributions put forward by the SHMA whilst at the same time scrubbing the backlog of delivery because a widely criticised and possibly short-lived formula, states that the district is an affordable place to live. The reason behind Bassetlaw's inability to deliver sufficient housing over the previous decade has in no small part been the myopic insistence that all development should be in the urban centres. It was only the lack of five year supply that allowed development in rural locations to occur at all. The LPA should allow this successful trend to continue but must differentiate between rural settlements allowing hitherto Rural Service Centres grow by up to 30%. The "need" for Garden Villages – if there is one – should be examined by the subsequent Local Plan allowing Bevercotes and Gamston to come forward as employment sites during this LP.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP271	Anonymous		Supported. So long as it includes social housing. We also need bungalows. In a few years time there will be more people in Worksoop retiring, but will not be able to downsize due to lack of properties.	Policy 4 Housing Mix will ensure that all housing sites provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes appropriate to the site size and needs of the area. This could include affordable housing and specific house types such as bungalows. The need for different types of properties will reflect that set out in the Bassetlaw Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
DBLP281	B Lange	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	NPPF para 68 refers to supporting the development of windfall sites. It is unclear how Bassetlaw intend to support the development of windfall sites given the Local Plan does not have a strategic policy on windfall sites, include any calculation of the potential contribution of windfall to housing land supply or incorporate windfall options in housing policies. Windfall sites are only mentioned as an option for Neighbourhood Plan steering groups (at 8.14). There should be a strategic policy on windfall sites.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. It is not considered necessary to include a specific windfall policy because the Plan is flexible enough to enable the delivery of this type of development.
DBLP287	M Lynam	Sheffield City Region	The LEPs Strategic Economic Plan sets out the economic ambitions and targets to deliver growth across the SCR seeking to create new jobs and attractive places to work, reside and spend leisure time. The SEP has a target to create 70,000 new jobs over 2015-25 and increase GVA in the City Region by 10% or £3bn and create an additional 6000 businesses. The intention is to have the revised SEP in place by summer 2019 although evidence suggests the targets are likely to remain. Analysis of the SEP targets suggests that Bassetlaw could be well placed to contribute up to 3700 of the 70,000 new jobs with particular potential in the logistics sector as well as jobs growth across the retail, tourism/visitor economy and health sectors. The Plan seeks to deliver 8ha of employment land a year – 136ha 2018-2035. This is above several economic forecasts in the EDNA and reflects the levels of growth experienced in Bassetlaw over recent years. Acknowledge the limitations in translating land requirements into absolute job figures but recognise the important contribution that these elements of the Plan would make to the economic ambitions set by the LEP and support the job targets in the SEP. Planning to deliver employment land at the higher end of future growth scenarios combined with a strategy that exploits regional and sub regional assets, demonstrates the ambition for new development in Bassetlaw and the role it can continue to play in the SCR economy. Note the positive approach taken to the A1 corridor with a focus on Harworth and Bircotes as well as proposals for two Garden Villages. The A1 Corridor is identified by the LEP as a key growth area for the City Region focused in particular on logistics, with the potential to attract regional and national operations. The success of this area will add significantly to the offer of the city region and ensure a stronger and more competitive economy. As such the LEP and MCA will continue to work closely with Bassetlaw to promote their development seeking to support further investment in infrastructure to enable land to be brought forward to maximise opportunities. The LEP and MCA also emphasised the important role that housing plays in creating the right conditions for growth, seeking to support an increase in housing delivery by unlocking sites through use of infrastructure funding as well as the creation of a dedicated SCR Housing Fund. Support the housing ambitions including the two Garden Villages which would complement similar proposals in other SCR districts and create a unique residential offer for the SCR. The housing target is above and beyond the local housing need calculation and reflects the LEPs growth ambitions as well as the need to provide for current communities.	Support for the approach taken to employment provision and identification of links to the SEP are welcome. Recognition that the housing target reflects the LEPs growth ambitions is positive and welcomed.
DBLP292	969674		Support for new employment land	Support for amount of employment land noted.
DBLP296	975737		No support for overall strategy.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP296	975737		Support for 6630 new homes provided that a lot of smaller homes are delivered for first time buyers and people wanting to downsize.	Policy 4 Housing Mix will ensure that all housing sites provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes appropriate to the site size and needs of the area. This could include affordable housing and specific house types such as bungalows. The need for different types of properties will reflect that set out in the Bassetlaw Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
DBLP296	975737		Support for employment land.	Support for amount of employment land noted.
DBLP301	977042		No support for 6630 homes. Infrastructure/services cannot sustain this level of growth. More roads are needed. Bassetlaw is supposed to be green - what about green spaces?	As part of the site selection process all infrastructure providers will be consulted, including the Highways Authority to make sure that any adverse impacts on infrastructure can be mitigated. Protection of green spaces is covered by Policies 18-20
DBLP301	977042		No support for new employment. There are currently lots of empty industrial units.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. This includes the re-use of existing buildings where appropriate.
DBLP303	978627		Whilst I support the need to cater for increased housing demand, perhaps other locations could be considered.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP303	978627		No support for new employment. Although there may be opportunities on the periphery of Gamston Airfield.	As part of the site selection process, a range of sites will be assessed for employment use including land adjacent to Gamston airfield. This will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP308	986480		No support for more housing and employment land	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP314	987642		No support for employment policy. This should be increased so that workers do not have to commute out of the District.	The level of employment land reflects the range of need identified by the Council's Economic Development Needs Assessment. The amount of employment land identified is a minimum - a higher amount of land would not necessarily prevent residents commuting out of the District, as there will always be a percentage of people who live and work in different locations.
DBLP314	987642		While the figures can be accepted it is how you intend to deliver this by ensuring existing centers are Tuxford. Harworth, Worksoy and Retford can be developed providing prosperity to very ailing heart of Bassetlaw.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP315	987680		Support proposed level of housing	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP315	987680		Support proposed level of employment. Strongly believe should be working with Gamston to make the airfield case even stronger, develop more business there, and include the community in events. Events such as fly ins, airshows, perhaps even bigger events should as concerts could be performed within the grounds. Direct access to the A1 make it perfectly located to handle masses of traffic. Should be looking to improve such sites, not remove them and build on them.	Support for level of employment noted. An analysis of the economic value of the airport is being undertaken which will inform the approach taken in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP317	987880		Support. Support housing expansion at both Worksoy and Harworth and future proposals in the rural villages. Propose that when future site allocation proposals come forward for Retford the Bassetlaw plan should include planning policies that say there will be NO expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. There should be specific reference made to agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane, Tilt Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing land availability, which will include land submitted for consideration in Retford. This will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP317	987880		Not sure about this as it depends where it will be. I don't agree if it's near housing and if it's really noisy.	The next version of the Local Plan will include planning policies on a range of matters including protecting residential amenity. This should help ensure that pollution and noise and the impacts on neighbours are managed appropriately.
DBLP318	987892		Support. I support the proposal for housing expansion at both Worksoy and Harworth and the rural villages. I propose that when future site allocation proposals come forward for Retford the Bassetlaw plan should include planning policies that say there will be NO expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. There should be specific reference made to agricultural land adjoining Ordsall and Bracken Lane, Tilt Lane Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing land availability, which will include land submitted for consideration in Retford. This will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP318	987892		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP319	987959		Support for number of homes proposed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP319	987959		No support for new employment.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP326	988057		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP326	988057		Support, but not at the expense of the loss of Gamston Airport.	Support for approach to employment land is noted. The Council has reviewed comments received and new evidence, including new sites submitted for consideration.
DBLP328	988061		Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP336	988172		No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP336	988172		No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP339	988184		No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP343	988216		Support	Support for approach to employment land is noted.
DBLP345	988237		Support	Support for approach to employment land is noted.
DBLP346	988247		No support. No - its just a way to keep the building trade going - look around all business parks built over the years and see just how many units empty !!!!! mixed small areas of employment and homes a lot more sustainable and maybe less need for transport to work	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP346	988247		Potential support. Only if it includes leaving Gamston (Retford) Airport as a proper working airport - in which there is already employment and thriving businesses there is already land that's been derelict for years - the old colliery sat there waiting to be used - close to A1 junction !!!!!	Support for approach to employment land is noted. An analysis of the aviation and economic value of the Airport is being undertaken and this will inform the next version of the Local Plan. Support for development of Bevercotes Colliery is noted.
DBLP349	988325		Support	Support for approach to employment land is noted.
DBLP351	988346		Do not believe the housing demand for this volume of new builds is required in the Retford area as opposed to Worksoy. In principle some development could take place at the Gamston airfield site but should be viewed as an enhancement for air operations with any major housebuilding taking place at alternative Brownfield sites	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP351	988346		There could still be infrastructure development in the vicinity of Gamston Airport that supports employment but leaves the airfield and runways available for continued use by GA.	An analysis of the aviation and economic value of the Airport is being undertaken and this will inform the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP352	988350		No support. No, Retford already has a large number of housing developments, further housing is not required and in my opinion, can not be supported by the current school, infrastructure and services in the area. A housing development is likely to only benefit the construction company and not the local community.	The Council is currently reviewing land availability, which will include land submitted for consideration in Retford. This will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. All infrastructure providers will be consulted on the sites to ensure that the level of housing mitigates impacts on the area's infrastructure.
DBLP352	988350		No support for policy. I support the current employment land based at Gamston Aerodrome to which is regularly visited by many of the local residents in Retford. Destroying these businesses will be a travesty to the local community and an embarrassment to Bassetlaw District Council.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Cannot guarantee all Neighbourhood plans in progress will / can deliver site allocations, that means more space will need to be found. Para 6.23 the use of Windfall developments will be / must be more in existence. Unless this plan infers mandatory site allocations made by the Council only.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. There has been on average, 92 new homes per annum built in the rural areas since 2010. This is with more restrictive policies in place. Given the flexibility of the proposed policies, it is expected that this trend will continue.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Neighbourhood Plan Delivery: Does this mean Bassetlaw will overwrite / over-rule Parishes with Neighbourhood Plans who could not get offered site allocations that meet the criteria set by the Neighbourhood Plan area and enforce the use of those offered sites despite the express wishes of the people of the parish that they were not suitable. That action simply over-rides the need for Neighbourhood Plans.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Neighbourhood Plans are required to accord with Local Plans and national plans, this includes delivering housing to meet the needs of the community. If neighbourhood plans do not allocate sites the Council will need to consider if it is necessary to allocate suitable sites.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Item 4, says 18 Hectares of land is required for economic development for rural settlements. Where is the allocation by settlement of this 18 hectares, what is being impressed upon us.	The Council is currently reviewing employment land availability. This will inform the site allocation in the rural area in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP357	Scrooby		Don't support. Can only really take your calculation for it, have no personal basis on which to make a judgement.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Don't support. Can only really take your calculation for it, have no personal basis on which to make a judgement.	The employment land requirement is set out in the Council's Economic Development Needs Assessment. It is based on the methodology set out in national planning guidance on Housing and Economic Needs Assessments.
DBLP359	988461		No I do not, this is not an ethical proposal. This is purely for economic demand and profit.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP360	988474		Drastically underestimates both the scale of potential job losses and the value of the airport in providing highly specialised services to the local and national economy. Section 3.2 of the plan states that "The single significant negative effect relates to the loss of employment land through cessation of airport operations. However, the scale of employment opportunities is likely to be relatively limited" and goes on to say that new jobs will be created in the 'garden village' that would replace the airport. Any jobs created in a 'garden village' are likely to be low skilled, smaller in number and far lower paid than those provided by existing airport, technology, pilot training and service industries currently based at Retford Airport. The following list has been compiled from publicly available data to describe some of the service, engineering, pilot training and technology sector businesses based at Retford airport, including: •A provider of full service airborne sensing solutions that operates a fleet of 10 'special mission' equipped aircraft fulfilling government and European agency contracts for airborne intelligence, surveillance & reconnaissance and aerial survey work. •The European headquarters of a multinational company who have a reputation as world leaders in providing flight inspection, navigation, communication and calibration services for air transportation. •Aircraft continuing airworthiness management, sales & contract maintenance. •Ground handling services for visiting business aircraft, passengers and pilots. •The UK & Eire distributor for aircraft manufactured by Diamond Aircraft Industries of Austria. •Five separate businesses are engaged in pilot training to European Aviation Safety Agency and Civil Aviation Authority standards, aircraft rental and trial flying lessons for local people. •An excellent cafe and restaurant. •A number of other local businesses, including providers of engineering and aviation services rely on the airport and visiting aircraft as a source of work. Nottinghamshire Police use the site (between 12 and 15 times per annum) to deliver advanced driver training in tactical pursuit and containment. •Aircraft owners and the Retford-Gamston based flying schools demonstrate a socially responsible approach to engaging with the wider community to improve knowledge of STEM subjects. For example, a recent children's charity day involving educational activities and a flying experience for local children.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP363	988482		No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP363	988482		Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP364	988487		Support for the number of homes proposed	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP364	988487		No support for the proposed amount of employment	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP372	988501		Do no support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP372	988501		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP373	988503		Support the need for more homes, but I do not support the location of Retford Gamston Airport as a site for a new village or any location which would impact on the Airport Operations.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP373	988503		No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP375	988527		No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP375	988527		No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP376	988557		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP376	988557		Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP380	988631		No support. Compared to the amount of jobs that would be lost (pilots, trainers, cafe staff, staff in other businesses), it is not enough to replace. And the majority of the new jobs would be unskilled or low skilled. These pilots have trained for years and invested thousands of pounds in their own training.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP384	988726		Subject to a fair and reasonable distribution within the area of proposed housing rather than larger developments that put pressure on local amenities	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP384	988726		Don't support. Wonder whether an annual allocation of 22.4 acres is sufficient to satisfy future annual growth ? Would like to see a greater variety of development types including for smaller and medium sizes businesses rather than all being taken up by larger distribution users. Would also like to see a wider distribution of commercial development land through out the district , rather than too much concentration in several larger sites	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. This includes the space for small and medium sized businesses. An assessment of employment land availability for the District is being undertaken. This will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP386	988747		Support. Yes but development to be within villages. Especially between East Markham and Tuxford.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP386	988747		Support. The employment development however should be to create real jobs not just warehousing / distribution where staff are paid minimum wage and are unable to buy homes	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. This includes space for a range of business opportunities to ensure a diverse mix of jobs can be delivered to meet local needs and aspirations.
DBLP387	988748		No support. 6630 extra homes - how many extra vehicles? What new roads are being built to ease traffic flow? How much extra energy needed for electricity and heating?	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP388	988749		No support. I think there should be lots more houses built than that but in existing developed areas eg East Markham, Tuxford, Askham, Darlton etc.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP388	988749		No support. Needs to be more to create sustainable communities with quality employment opportunities rather than distribution centres which only offer low quality employment.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. This includes space for a range of business opportunities to ensure a diverse mix of jobs can be delivered to meet local needs and aspirations.
DBLP389	988774		No support. Do not know enough to be able to answer this, just know that doing so on Retford /Gamston airport is detrimental.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP389	988774		No support. Do not know enough to be able to answer this, just know that doing so on Retford /Gamston airport is detrimental.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP391	988813		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP391	988813		Support	Support for approach to employment land noted.
DBLP392	988889		Do not support the concentration of housing in one area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP392	988889		Support	Support for approach to employment land noted.
DBLP393	989007		Support. But only private development with affordable housing included.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP393	989007		Use whatever land you want so long as it is not agricultural nor recreational. Look around the world and see what other nations are doing - good example is 'Lakeside' development at Doncaster.	An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken to inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. The loss of high quality agricultural land will be minimised. The loss of recreational land will be avoided where practicable.
DBLP394	989023		No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP394	989023		No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP398	989658		No support. Who are these homes for? At the consultation I was told for people who live at home with their parents. Will they be affordable housing then if this is the target population? Seems unlikely.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP398	989658		No support. Insufficient to support the number of new homes and existing population.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP399	989741		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP399	989741		Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP402	990030		Don't support. It is considered that this will neither meet housing needs or provide sufficient flexibility to ensure delivery of sufficient housing. Any housing target should be a minimum housing delivery target rather than become a constraint to delivery.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP402	990030		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP403	990043		Support. Is this enough?	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP403	990043		Support. Any new employment to the area would be a boost for communities	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP404	990059		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP404	990059		Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.

DBLP405	990062		Support. I appreciate that homes are needed but believe that there are better locations, especially than Gamston - the 2 power stations are due to close, how seriously have these been considered? The figure of 390 is an average not the actual number that would be built in a year and is misleading	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP405	990062		Don't support. There is insufficient information to show support or otherwise for this question. Do not know how much space is required for a business to operate so would not know if 136 hectares is appropriate. B1, B2, B8 business types all require a good road (and ideally rail) network. The local plan does not identify where this would be sited. There are 2 A roads in an east/west direction - the A57 and the A631 and in a northerly route the A1, A614 and A60 are the options. It does not appear that if the employment land is for B1, B2, B8 use that these corridors are being used - the A1 being the only one that could logically be improved to cope. 'A', C and D businesses could be located more randomly but would logically need to be in the vicinity of the significant housing developments if they are not to become large estates but this will not support the town centres. Town centres need the investment.	The Economic Development needs Assessment provides indicative guidance on the amount of floorspace that could be accommodated by different types of employment development. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. It is acknowledged that good access is important for many businesses. The next version of the Local Plan will include policies that promote Town Centres and appropriate development within their boundaries.
DBLP410	990076		Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP410	990076		Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP411	990079		No support. Surely restoring/ renovating some empty properties would be better use of resources. As these properties already have the necessary services connected. Renovation could incorporate more energy efficient solutions thus not decreasing farm land and encroaching on the countryside. Causing less impact on the environment and the wildlife it supports.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Empty properties are already taken into account in the calculation of housing need.
DBLP411	990079		No support. No because of the impact on wildlife etc as stated above. Also surely post Brexit we need to be more self sustaining and need to use farmland more efficiently not just build houses on it !!!!!	An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. One area for consideration will be the impact upon the natural environment including wildlife sites. The loss of high quality agricultural land will be minimised where practicable.
DBLP415	990150		The respondent does not object to the proposed housing provision of 6630 dwellings but does not support the allocation of 1000 dwellings from this total to a largely speculative new village proposal. If the Council is keen to support the new villages proposal, then it should not be at the expense of Retford which is considered to be under-provided in the emerging plan, and at the expense of flexibility in the rural settlement which individually or collectively provide essential services and facilities that need to be preserved and where appropriate future proofed for expansion. The Draft local plan's consideration of the range of housing requirement options included an economic growth option of 417 dwellings per annum. This is not substantially higher than the currently suggested provision of 390 dwellings per annum yet could be supported to accommodate the new villages option which the respondent only considers to be feasible in a wider scenario of positive economic growth.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP415	990150		The policy for rural economic growth is supported as long as Draft Policy 8 remains reflective of and compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework. Have no objection to the level of employment land proposed	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. This employment in the rural area which will be consistent with the NPPF. Support for the employment land target is noted.
DBLP416	990240		Support. Yes, but in locations with good access to the major Road Links, not those within the Urban Areas as shown on the Plans. 136 hectares may or may not be sufficient, and could probably be met from existing "true" Brownfield Land. However, the proposal to change the Gamston Site's usage is not acceptable. Located on this Airfield are a number of highly technical business with 'high level jobs' that will be lost without any guarantee that they will be replaced by jobs of a similar calibre. Gamston Site is not a 'Brownfield' site as there is an extensive use, or capability for use, as agricultural land in addition to the Industrialised Area and Employment created by the Gamston Airport based Companies. As the UK enters the unsure grounds of Brexit we need to retain all of our current Agricultural Land for Food Production, and further encourage such use. 'Concreting over' is not the answer.	An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Based on the land submitted for consideration it is unlikely that the need can be made from brownfield land. Consideration also needs to be given to market demand for brownfield land. It is acknowledged that should Retford Gamston Airport close some aviation businesses may have to relocate out of the District. The proposal is for some employment land to be provided on Gamston, it is not possible to determine the types of jobs that could be generated. The loss of high quality agricultural land will be minimised where practicable.
DBLP416	990240		Don't support. The Bassetlaw District Council has, I believe around 7.5 years of Land Stock for Housing. Added to this is the Report in September 2018 (Action on Empty Houses) that there are 1,292 Unoccupied and Substantially Unfurnished Properties in Bassetlaw, of which some 600 are classed as 'Long Term Empty' (over 6 months). These and other such properties should be brought into use before more land is taken for Housing. There has not been sufficient action taken to reduce the number of empty/underused properties within Bassetlaw.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Empty properties are already taken into account in the calculation of housing need.
DBLP418	990387		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP418	990387		Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP419	990400		No support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP419	990400		Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP420	990465		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP420	990465		Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP421	990489		Don't support. I want to see firm evidence of employment development before I would support this. The population growth figures provided in the Plan do not show that anything like this amount of housing is required. Would like to see an clear explanation for residents as to why this amount of housing is needed rather than the obscure justification given in the plan. There is a huge hole in this plan regarding the justification for building the number of houses proposed. If residents are to be asked to agree this then Bassetlaw need to give clear explanations as to why this amount of housing is necessary. The explanations for employment growth do not have anything like sufficient substance to justify the proposed housing figures.	The employment land requirement is set out in the Council's Economic Development Needs Assessment. It is based on the methodology set out in national planning guidance on Housing and Economic Needs Assessments. The amount of housing required is based on a standard methodology that is provided by Government.
DBLP421	990489		Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP422	990506		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP422	990506		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP423	990541		Support. The homes are needed, but should be built in such a way as not to destroy existing infrastructure and jobs, such as those at Retford Gamston airfield	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP423	990541		Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP424	990549		Don't support. There are already large new developments in South Yorkshire which are not selling; people want to live near jobs. Developing brown and greenfield sites into new houses from which people can commute to other towns and cities is counter-productive.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP424	990549		Don't support. There is already employment in the airfield which will be lost, affecting the local and wider region as fuel suppliers, maintenance companies, flight training schools, taxis and ground services lose their jobs. Bulldozing existing employment is not a good way to build new jobs.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP425	990570		Don't support. Too many.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP425	990570		Don't support. Is this code for more warehousing? Plus destroying an airfield removes existing employment land!	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP426	990571		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP426	990571		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP427	990577		Support. Too many people!	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP427	990577		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP428	990594		Don't support. Too much for the area	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP428	990594		Don't support. Loss of airfield.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP429	990613		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP429	990613		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP430	990614		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP430	990614		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP431	990633		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP431	990633		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP434	990659		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP434	990659		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP435	990666		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP435	990666		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP436	990682		Support. Yes, but you need to think more carefully about the opportunity and ecological cost of the planned proposals Rethink the locations.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP436	990682		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP437	990704		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP437	990704		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP438	990717		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP438	990717		Don't support. There comes a point where a council has to say no to protect its residents. No everyone wants to live in a town / city we move to rural locations for a reason. The plan quotes health and wellbeing - building in rural locations does not help towards this it actually does the opposite	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP439	990719		Don't support. People dont want to work locally main communte to the citys - sheffield lincoln etc as the money and career prospects better. By moving the business from Gamston Airfield you are taking away everything you say you want to bring to the area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP440	990764		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP440	990764		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP441	990783		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP441	990783		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP442	990799		Don't support. Are these homes really required? I think not, the Council is just complying with Government instructions.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP442	990799		Don't support. What employment? This would only apply during construction.	The Local Plan should provide for sufficient employment land to meet the needs of the District over the plan period. This is not just construction jobs but will also need to provide for jobs for those who work in offices, industry, manufacturing and other types of employment.
DBLP443	990800		Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP443	990800		Support the provision of 136 hectares of employment land across the district. Figure 3 sets out that 13% (18 hectares) of this will be provided within the rural settlements and 33% (45 hectares) is to be provided within Worksoop. Support Policy 2 which confirms that this is a minimum figure and that it is expected that other sites will come forward within the plan period, this is in accordance with the NPPF which seeks to boost economic growth. Site at Carlton Forest does not lie in an existing rural settlement. It is located in an established employment location on the edge of Worksoop. Greater support should be provided in the supporting text for sites in the rural area, but outside of rural settlements that are sustainably and well located to contribute to the Council's employment land supply. EDNA confirms that the Worksoop Market has a high level of services and good transport infrastructure. The area is the key work destination concentrating 38% of the total employment of the District. Industrial activity in the district is focussed around Worksoop, FCC's site which is 680m from the development boundary of Worksoop is suitably located to contribute to economic growth through the provision of additional employment floorspace. The EDNA confirms there is a demand for small industrial units and that particularly for the industrial market there is high demand and short supply. Carlton Forest has outline planning permission for 6 units of circa 521m2 each or 1 unit of circa 3000m2 (B2 or B8 Use Class) which is able to meet this demand. A neighbouring site at Carlton Forest in the same ownership is able to deliver further employment floorspace of approximately 3,750m2.	Support for the employment land targets is noted. Acknowledgement that this is a minimum figure is noted. The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Basissetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. This will include employment growth in the rural area. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP444	990802		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP444	990802		Do not support. It is well-known that young people want to live in or near large cities not only for employment possibilities and access to universities and colleges but also for their leisure and retail activities. Two garden villages whilst providing new housing may not be too attractive to young employed people and so the new villages may have a predominance of older people who may not contribute directly to the local economy as much as they would if nearer to city conurbations. Many people will no doubt commute to local towns and cities and not to the Retford area. There should therefore be a focus around current centres of the population where there are appropriate employment opportunities and public services which could be expanded more easily and economically than setting up brand new standalone facilities in rural areas. Understand from local people who have lived in new villages elsewhere in the country that schools and other services and facilities are not provided until at least 10 years into a large house project.	Whilst some younger people may prefer to live and work in cities the Local Plan must make provision for those who may wish to live in other locations, or who may not be able to purchase a home in a city and may look further afield. Where possible new employment/housing will be identified in sustainable locations close to existing town centres and transport hubs. However, this is not always possible. Where sites are identified in other locations necessary infrastructure will be sought to ensure that residents have the opportunity to use other modes of transport and not just the private car. It is acknowledged that schools and other facilities provided by new development generally do not be provided until a quantum of homes have been developed when there is the funding available to support provision.
DBLP445	990806		Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP445	990806		Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP446	990814		Do not support. Out of the blue, villages in the area that deemed unsustainable last year are now required to have new build. No explanation for this change has been given. The plan has effectively run roughshod over many village neighbourhood plans, negating many hours of hard work	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP446	990814		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP447	990818		Do not support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP447	990818		Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP448	990826		Do not support. I can not support a plan for that number of new homes. The council should investigate whether other areas are better equipped to cope with an increase in new homes.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP448	990826		Support. I would be happy for the council to encourage new business to set up at the former Bevercotes Colliery site & also the Gamston airfield, as long as the roads are upgraded to cope with the increase in traffic.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP449	990829		Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP449	990829		Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP450	990836		Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP450	990836		Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP451	990837		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP451	990837		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP452	990841		Do not support. Why on earth would we need that many new homes in a rural area anyway?? There aren't the jobs or local amenities and facilities to support that number	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP452	990841		Do not support. Definitely not. People should not be put out of a job and made unemployed by any proposals.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more
DBLP453	990842		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP453	990842		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP454	990843		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP454	990843		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP455	990845		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP455	990845		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP456	990846		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP456	990846		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP457	990847		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP457	990847		Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP458	990848		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP458	990848		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP459	990849		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP459	990849		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP460	990850		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP460	990850		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP461	990852		Support. Another site should be found rather than destroying the jobs and businesses at Gamston Airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP461	990852		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP462	990854		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP462	990854		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP463	990855		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP463	990855		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP464	990856		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP464	990856		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP465	990859		Support. But these should not be built on existing sites with businesses who are doing their best to suport the community. The restaurant, many flying schools, freight and support services are sl required. Do you know how many airline pilots start their training at flying schools like the ones at Gamston. The airlines dont train them. Budding pilots need places like Gamston to get their foot on the ladder to an amazing career.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP465	990859		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP466	990862		Do not support. I would support this if it doesn't destroy current infrastructure.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP466	990862		Do not support. No, the knock on effect to Retford airport seems not be have been considered.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP467	990865		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP467	990865		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP468	990869		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP468	990869		Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP469	990882		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP469	990882		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP470	990884		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP470	990884		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP471	990885		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP471	990885		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP472	990886		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP472	990886		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP473	990889		Support. Local affordable housing is certainly required within the growing population of not only Bassetlaw but the East Midlands in general.	The Local Plan (Policy 3) recognises the need for affordable housing to meet identified local needs
DBLP474	990891		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP474	990891		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP475	990893		Support. Yes, but they should not be built in Gamston airfield, instead build in existing neighbourhoods or on other redundant land.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP475	990893		Do not support. Gamston airfield already provides employment so should not be built on, use land elsewhere.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP476	990895		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP476	990895		Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP477	990901		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP477	990901		Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP478	990904		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP478	990904		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP479	990910		Support. This is a figure that supports the need for housing for a growing population nationally. However, the council really needs to consider it's commitment to economic development in providing homes, close to employment opportunities.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP479	990910		Support. Yes, this appears to be a wise approach in allocating new sites for development and employment opportunities. However, again the council needs to consider its approach to this and not utilise land currently providing employment opportunities for residential development.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP480	990912		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP480	990912		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP481	990913		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP481	990913		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP482	990914		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP482	990914		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP483	990915		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP483	990915		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP484	990916		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP484	990916		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP485	990917		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP485	990917		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP486	990918		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP486	990918		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP487	990919		Support. Yes but not on what is Gamston Airport	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP487	990919		Support. But not at Gamston Airport	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP488	990921		Do not support. We don't need more houses. What is needed is considerable analysis on areas of land that is not occupied with infrastructure currently benefiting the council. A counter productive move would be to close the airport with the amount of money it brings in catalytically to the local economy. Many councils are out of touch with this. Don't let Bassetlaw be another.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP488	990921		Do not support. You have employment land already in the Airport. Flying schools, air operators, restaurant workers and ground crew to name but a few. Extend that on to the supportive roles behind these companies such as accountants who I would believe to be close to the airport, closing such a catalyst would be a brave move.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP489	990922		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP489	990922		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP490	990926		Do not support. Too many homes, reject the plans.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP490	990926		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP491	990928		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP491	990928		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP492	990930		Do not support. Not at the airfield as above.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP492	990930		Do not support. Not at the airfield as above. The airfield already provides high skilled employment.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP493	990933		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP493	990933		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP494	990934		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP494	990934		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP495	990936		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP495	990936		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP496	990937		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP496	990937		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP497	990938		Do not support. No, traffic going down Ollerton road into Retford through Ordsall is ridiculous, there is no car parks on the Worksoop side of Retford, so if you think traffic will filter through Ordsall to them go through the centre of town to get parked you are severely mistaken! They're going to cut through Retford to park at Asda, Aldi, Wilco, home bargains.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP497	990938		Do not support. Not seen any informations regarding this matter.	Chapters 1 and 2 of the Local Plan contain information on the employment strategy for the District, including employment land targets.
DBLP498	990940		Do not support. I can see the evidence for the need of housing in Worksoop however, I can see no such evidence for the need of housing of the scale proposed for Retford for the reasons explained by myself in the comment box at the bottom of the page.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Bassetlaw EDNA study identifies a need to deliver 390 dwellings per annum in the district over the next 15 years. The Plan proposes to distribute development across the district to meet the housing needs of each area. As the second largest settlement, Retford will need to accommodate development to meet its need.
DBLP498	990940		Do not support. Employment land clearly has its benefits, however as a portion of the employment land is proposed to be built on the site of Gamston Airport, cannot support the proposal. The 'Garden Village' proposed to be built on the airport will generate lower paid, lower skilled jobs than the existing successful airport. Quantity of jobs seems to be the priority of the proposal rather than the quality.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP499	990942		Support. But find the land elsewhere.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP499	990942		Support. If the employment includes the highly skilled jobs already existing at the airport. Swapping those for McJobs and call centres makes no sense.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP500	990943		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP500	990943		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP501	990944		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP501	990944		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP502	990946		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP502	990946		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP503	M Turner		Do not support. The Draft Local Plan fails to provide evidence for the scale of development required nor provides a valid economic argument how it would generate the needed employment in the area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council's Economic Development Needs Assessment indicates there is a need for housing and employment.
DBLP503	M Turner		The Plan's destruction of skilled employment to build houses is contradictory to its own strategic objectives 4 and 6 for economic development and fails to recognise the opportunity the airport presents as a local economic hub. Retford Gamston Airport directly supports approximately 100 skilled jobs. The plan in Section 3.2 of claims that this will have a 'relatively limited' economic impact and new jobs will be created within the garden village. This assertion fails to define the type, skill level or numbers of new jobs that would be created, whether permanent or temporary, or what facilities will be created to house the jobs. The national tendency for large supermarkets and the move to on-line shopping indicates that retail is unlikely. Without a clear plan as to how new jobs are to be created and considering the differential in skills, and therefore income, generated from the new jobs then the new plan is simply to destroy jobs in favour of houses. The plan approach fails to consider that the airport has a wide range of users from students to executives, to aviation businesses. These highly skilled people are the current and future entrepreneurs. They are the ones likely to invest and take a risk to generate new employment for others. Removing the airport is likely to result in their move outside of Bassetlaw having a negative economic impact. Opportunity for economic regeneration Retford Gamston Airport represents an opportunity as a focus for skilled economic regeneration. Examples of other airfields in the UK and Europe show that airfields can become economic hubs. Gloucester Airport is an example of a thriving UK small airport that is owned by 2 district councils. They have supported the airport and its continued growth over many years which in 2017 was home to around 180 aircraft and 40 aviation-related businesses employing more than 500 people, plus a further 2000 jobs on the adjoining business park. There is enough land and space available at Retford Gamston Airport to create a larger business park, leisure facilities and further hangars. Expanding the range of businesses at the airport to include a technology centre or similar would make it more attractive and increase economic activity. This in turn would generate more skilled jobs, demand for houses in Retford and retain the airport. The airport would complement and support housing development on its periphery and across the motorway at Bevercoates.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP503	M Turner		Do not support. The Plan fails to provide compelling arguments for the location of the Garden villages. It does not provide any alternatives for smaller scale developments along the A1M corridor which can readily be identified with simple online mapping tools. Instead of destroying vital national infrastructure and skilled jobs Bassetlaw District Council could support the airport and build an economic hub.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An analysis of the aviation and economic value of the Airport is being undertaken and this will inform the the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP504	990949		Do not support. If you got to built make them council house.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP504	990949		Do not support. No one wants to move where before so why would they now.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP505	C Taylor		Do not support. I believe it would be better if homes were built in smaller pockets across all the area rather than what is proposed ,not everyone wants or even knows how to live a village life ,try converting the empty flays above the shops in towns as well .	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP505	C Taylor		Support. As Gamston airfield already has businesses on it ,it would be a good idea to encourage more to the site but be aware that the main road through Gamston is unsuitable for heavy traffic and the exit and entrance on and off the A1 at Twyford Bridge is inadequate to say the least .	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An analysis of the aviation and economic value of the Airport is being undertaken and this will inform the the next version of the Local Plan. Part of the site selection process involves consulting the Highways Authority who will advise on the suitability of the road network to accommodate new development.
DBLP506	990952		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP506	990952		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP507	990954		Support. We need more housing as a nation full stop!	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP507	990954		Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP508	990955		Do not support. Absolutely not, if they are to be built by the lowest possible bidder. And not if they end up being anonymous boxes the same as the housing estates up and down the country, spoiling the naturally evolving British countryside .	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP508	990955		Do not support. Absolutely not. At the cost of 10 business and more than 100 jobs at Gamston alone, hectares of wasteland with probably no utilities, left to weed, creating a perfect potential spot for the next warehousing/lorry park/retail estate eyesore! There isn't a small business that has the capital to build premises just because there is vacant wasteland.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An analysis of the aviation and economic value of the Airport is being undertaken and this will inform the the next version of the Local Plan. Part of the site selection process involves consulting the Highways Authority who will advise on the suitability of the road network to accommodate new development.
DBLP509	990959		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP509	990959		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP510	990961		Support. To be built on redundant brownfield land.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP510	990961		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP511	990962		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP511	990962		Do not support. The closure of Gamston Airport will jeopardise a significant number of jobs in Bassetlaw.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP512	990964		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP512	990964		Do not support. The established businesses at Gamston Airport should be allowed to continue to provide skilled employment. For example Gamston Airport has aircraft maintenance facilities and not all airfields have maintenance facilities. This needs to be preserved as part of the national infrastructure of airfields. Gamston Airport also supports the Air Ambulance - a service that the locals might appreciate personally one day in their time of need!	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP513	990965		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP513	990965		Support	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP514	990980		Do not support. YOU DO NOT STATE WHETHER THESE ARE NEW BUILDS. Make yourselves clear. There are vacant properties, and other buildings, which should be converted to housing, before any more land is requisitioned. According to para. 10.7 of the Plan, Retford only needs 437 homes up to year 2035 to fulfil its requirements, yet you're proposing to build many more than that whilst destroying part of the transport infrastructure you say you're preserving and extending.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is unable to provide that level of detail in the strategic plan. More detail will be included in the next draft plan. This is likely to include both brownfield sites and greenfield sites.
DBLP514	990980		Support. Why not keep the valuable employment land you already have which houses people gainfully employed in skilled jobs, and develop other TRULY "brownfield" areas instead??	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Available brownfield sites will be considered but it is not possible to meet the employment needs of the District on brownfield land only, some greenfield land will need to be considered. An analysis of the aviation and economic value of the Airport is being undertaken and this will inform the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP515	991045		Do not support. Our area probably does not need this many new homes. But in any case they should be more spread out, two villages within a few miles of each other is poor spatial planning.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make any necessary amendments.
DBLP515	991045		Do not support. I support the principle but cannot click 'yes' here because in good faith because your plan destroys employment land at the airport. A couple of corner shops doesn't replace the engineering jobs that our area should be proud of.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP516	991153		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP516	991153		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP517	991157		Support. But only if it is fairly distributed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP517	991157		Do not support. No as there will be many skilled jobs that will be lost due to the closure of Gamston airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP518	991172		Do not support. This plan does not say how that figure was reached. BDC is 7.9 years ahead on building and it does not say if this figure is included in these figures or not. I am not against development but I believe for this figure to be assessed we need all the information available. This plan has also not shown any predictions on air quality in this area, which is already above average for Bassetlaw.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Sites in the Housing Year Land Supply (which currently equates to 7.9 years) are included in the calculation of housing supply in the draft Local Plan. The next draft Plan will include a Housing Trajectory.
DBLP518	991172		Do not support. Not if it is only in the two areas that are already above average in NO2 emissions in Bassetlaw, which will increase air pollution substantially especially when it's co located with large amounts of housing. There is also the issue of enforcement which is non-existent within the area at present, an increase in industrial units will only exacerbate that.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. This will include sites across the District and not just at the Garden Villages.
DBLP519	991173		Do not support. We understand we have already reached the experience-led quota of residential homes.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP519	991173		Support. If your meaning building of commercial infrastructure?	Support for employment land targets welcome. Employment land refers to offices, industry and storage/warehousing as well as other employment-related commercial development.
DBLP520	991174		Do not support. This plan does not say how that figure was reached. BDC is 7.9 years ahead on building and it does not say if this figure is included in these figures or not. I am not against development but I believe for this figure to be assessed we need all the information available. This plan has also not shown any predictions on air quality in this area, which is already above average for Bassetlaw.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Sites in the Housing Year Land Supply (which currently equates to 7.9 years) are included in the calculation of housing supply in the draft Local Plan. The next draft Plan will include a Housing Trajectory.

DBLP520	991174		Do not support. No as it's only in the two areas that are already above average in NO2 emissions in Bassetlaw, which will increase air pollution substantially especially when it's co located with large amounts of housing. There is also the issue of enforcement which is non existent within the area at present, an increase in industrial units will only exacerbate that.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. This will include sites across the District and not just at the Garden Villages.
DBLP521	991176		Do not support. No. There whole estates of empty houses on the outskirts of Sheffield eg Dyke Vale Road. Why not re-develop these areas. Cities can cope with expansion/development - rural areas cannot without radically changing the environment.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP521	991176		Do not support. There is already enough expansion of the industrial areas, especially around Worksop - again leading to loss of wildlife habitat and countryside.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Brownfield sites will be considered but it is not possible to provide for all employment needs on brownfield land so some greenfield sites will need to be considered. The impact on the natural environment is one issue that will be considered during the site selection process.
DBLP522	991178		Do not support. Although Worksop has a case for local Housing need , the same cannot be said for Retford which in the last 8 years has already had significant growth without the need to destroy the existing infrastructure. And at what seems the stroke of a pen it would appear Bassetlaw is now ahead of its building requirements up to 7.9 years from less than 5 is this new figure taking into account the proposed developments .	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP522	991178		Support. The 2 new proposed sites for the garden Villages would be better suited to Commercial / Industrial use Existing areas struggle with access, such as the low bridge at Boughton which restricts access to the A614 to relocate businesses and create existing ones on the Brownfield sites such as Gamston Airfield they would then have clear unrestricted access to the A1. There seems to be no discussion regarding the loss of jobs at Gamston airport which are in excess of 100 add to this the closure of both the local coal fired power stations where are all these new residents (If the proposed site is residential) going to work ? as jobs are limited in the first place and not everyone in the area is semi or unskilled .	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP523	991181		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP523	991181		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP524	991184		Do not support. In the complete absence of a clearly defined strategy within the plan to attract a large number of businesses that will create the necessary levels of employment then all that the house building programme will achieve is to provide a base for yet more commuters needing to travel outside of Bassetlaw for employment. The additional housing will therefore provide substantially reduced benefits to the local economy and add to traffic levels, noise and pollution.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP524	991184		Do not support. You could allocate half the total land area of Bassetlaw to employment but in the total absence of a strategy, or the means such as still having a local general aviation and business airport, to attract businesses to locate within the area then what do you realistically achieve?	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear approach for the consideration of different types of employment growth in the future. The basis of these policies will be the Council's Economic Development Needs Assessment, Strategic Economic Plans and Local Industrial Strategies. An analysis of the aviation and economic value of the Airport is being undertaken and this will inform the the next version of the Local Plan. It is not clear at this stage that the airport has attracted businesses to locate in the area.
DBLP525	991186		Do not support. I cannot accept that this level of development is required in an essentially rural area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP525	991186		Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP526	991188		Do not support. I have no comment on this.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP526	991188		Do not support. This plan involves the loss of high technology jobs at Gamston Airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP527	991190		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP527	991190		Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP528	991208		Do not support. I think there should be more built.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP528	991208		Support. But needs to be high quality business zones not just warehousing and distribution.	Support for employment land targets welcome. The Economic Development Needs Assessment sets out the amount and type of employment land that is required in the District. It will include warehousing and distribution but will also provide for offices, industrial and other commercial employment.
DBLP529	991209		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP529	991209		Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP530	991219		Do not support. It is far too many!	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP530	991219		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP531	991221		Do not support. I believe the council is 7.9 years ahead of its building needs and whilst I agree with some growth in the area, it should be spread over the whole council's area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The suggested approach does not accord with national policy (NPPF) and would be an unsound approach.
DBLP531	991221		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP532	Gareth Evans		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP532	Gareth Evans		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP533	991230		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP533	991230		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP534	991231		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP534	991231		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP535	991234		Support. Please build more.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP535	991234		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP536	991235		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP536	991235		Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP537	991237		Do not support. I do not believe that there is the demand or infrastructure to support this. Nor do I believe the promised infrastructure in this plan to support the additional properties will ever be delivered.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council are working closely with infrastructure providers to identify requirements associated with new development. The Plan includes an infrastructure delivery policy to address this.
DBLP537	991237		Do not support. Again I do not believe the demand or infrastructure to support this is available.	An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process is consulting infrastructure providers who advise whether infrastructure can accommodate the development proposed.
DBLP538	991240		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP538	991240		Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP539	991241		Do not support. The garden villages are far to large. The airport site would be the size of a small town. Not a village.....	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP539	991241		Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP540	991243		Do not support. New homes will always be required but that should not be at the expense of local businesses. A better strategy should be created that incorporates what is already in place in the local area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP540	991243		Do not support. It seems to me that you're using too much land. As stated new housing will always be required, however this should not be at the cost of infrastructure that is already in place. Either less land should be used, or a more space efficient housing development should be created.	The amount of land required for employment is identified in the Economic Development Needs Assessment. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Where possible this will involve re-using brownfield land but it is not possible to meet the District's needs on brownfield sites so some greenfield land will need to be developed. Developers are encouraged to use sites as efficiently as possible, whilst meeting are relevant building, design and safety standards.
DBLP541	991264		Support. But not at the expense of an existing employment and business location. New developments are meant to add to facilities and not to merely replace one existing and active facility with housing just to avoid any perception of planning issues.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP541	991264		Do not support. There is no increase or change in employment land by building on the airfield at Gamston. What will happen is that high skill and relative high wage jobs will be replaced by low skill warehousing type jobs. There is no evidence to suggest that a reduction in locations to train and recruit the future pilots that the UK needs will be economically offset by their replacement by low skill jobs in sufficient numbers to ensure this development will have a positive economic benefit to the area or to the UK as a whole.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP542	991336		Support. See above.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP542	991336		Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP543	991990		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP543	991990		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP544	992014		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP544	992014		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP545	992366		Support. The Draft local plan (Page 42 for Mattersey parish shows a 10% housing requirement of 32. This requirement is in line with 2011 Census table KS401EW which shows a total of 325 dwellings for the parish. Draft Local Plan (Page 42) also shows a 20% Capped growth of 60 dwellings, which understates the correct calculation (ie 20%x325=65 Dwellings cap). Please correct in the next draft.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The 10% housing requirement relates to the Parish of Mattersey. Whereas, the 20% cap relates to the settlements in Mattersey Parish. It is therefore a different calculation.
DBLP545	992366		Support.	Support for employment land targets welcome.
DBLP546	992635		Do not support. Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP546	992635		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP547	993337		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP547	993337		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP548	993387		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP548	993387		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
Policy 3: Affordable Housing				
DBLP136	J Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	The level of affordable housing which is required in the District is likely to exceed the amount of affordable housing which the Local Plan can deliver; certainly through open market led housing schemes. The Local Plan acknowledges this problem. It does not seek to quantify a potential solution to that problem. Paras 7.6 and 7.8 note that there are other mechanisms outside of the planning (S.106) system to secure the delivery of affordable housing. Those processes exist and have not delivered a significant amount of affordable housing. No evidence that there are alternate mechanisms capable of delivering of the affordable housing required. The Local Plan should set out a strategy to secure the delivery of affordable housing through those mechanisms and seek to quantify the amount and type of affordable housing that the Council envisages will come forward through those mechanisms. It is a vital part of planning for the needs of the District that the Local Plan quantifies its likely shortfalls in delivery and that mechanisms to mitigate those shortfalls are provided in planning policy. Where it is known that the Council will be relying on affordable housing schemes being delivered through grant funded schemes it will be vital to make available sites which can be accessed by Registered Providers e.g. there is no robust rural exception policy that allows for the delivery of affordable housing. Encourage such a provision. Policy 3 is too vague in how it will achieve its aims of increasing affordable housing. The affordable housing policy will require a lower level of affordable housing provision than required by the Core Strategy. Do not consider that the Policy will be effective. Support the Council's pragmatic approach to the assessment of viability in development proposals and welcome the realistic approach taken to understanding the viability issues within the housing market and with previously developed land. Consider that the Council can mitigate viability problems to a greater extent by encouraging development in stronger market areas in the District. Recent housing delivery demonstrates that Retford is the strongest market for housing delivery within Bassetlaw's main settlements and the Local Plan should benefit from that market strength by increasing housing provision at Retford and maximising the affordable housing provision that can be delivered through open market provision.	The primary purpose of Policy 3 is to set out the approach to securing affordable housing through the planning system. However, it is accepted that this is part of a wider strategy to increase provision of affordable housing through other means. Further context will be added to the Local Plan to better explain how the planning system will complement other housing delivery in the District. Support for the Council's approach to viability is welcome. An update to the Interim Whole Plan Viability is being undertaken which will consider any potential changes to securing a greater level of affordable housing in different parts of the District.
DBLP173	J Cox	Lichfields on behalf of SP Scholey and the estate of WA Scholey	Welcome that Policy 3 allows for off-site contributions to be made – where it is justified to do so – in lieu of affordable housing.	Support for off site contributions welcome.

DBLP192	B Lomas	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	The Core Strategy seeks a different percentage requirement in different settlements, whereas the Plan proposes a blanket 20% requirement on Greenfield sites and 10% requirement on Brownfield sites. There is no justification in the supporting text to this policy to explain this alternative approach. Given the differing housing markets across the District, it is questionable whether a 20% requirement across the district on greenfield sites is deliverable and achievable. Following submission of site specific economic viability appraisals, in recent years there have been a number of housing developments that have delivered less than 15% affordable housing on greenfield sites. It is important that flexibility in this policy allows for site by site viability and with this in mind we request that "where viable" is inserted so that the policy reads: "The Council will require on-site contributions to be made in accordance with the following qualifying thresholds and requirements where viable:" Welcome the inclusion of the Council's consideration of Open Book Financial Viability Statements where specific site viability is raised. Given the viability implications associated with the adopted Community Infrastructure Levy and the additional requirements to deliver contributions to primary school education the Council should undertake a wide ranging viability assessment of the Local Plan prior to the publication of the next iteration of the document.	The Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Assessment sets out the justification for not seeking a different affordable housing percentage in different parts of the District. However, it is expected that the next version of the draft Local Plan will provide an explanation of the proposed approach in the reasoned justification. The Assessment will be updated to inform the next version of the Plan and will take into account comments made during this consultation. However, national planning practice guidance is clear that the role for viability assessment is primarily at the plan making stage and that it is the responsibility of site promoters to take into account any costs including their profit expectations and risks, and ensure that proposals for development are policy compliant. In future, where up-to-date policies have set out the contributions expected from development, planning applications that comply should be assumed to be viable. It is the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances, such as those identified in the PPG, justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage.
DBLP194	H Leggett	Emery Planning on behalf of J J G Pears Property Ltd	Para 7.5 identifies that some 39% of the District's overall housing requirement is for affordable homes. This is a very significant proportion and the Plan acknowledges it will be very difficult to achieve. Major previously developed sites could offer an opportunity to help assist in meeting some of this potentially unmet need. Consideration should be given to a policy to support affordable housing where it can be accommodated as part of wider development on major previously developed sites in the rural area. The Council's recognition of the clear need for economic regeneration and the importance of improving employment levels and incomes in contributing to reducing affordable housing need is welcomed. Support for the economic redevelopment of sites such as the Former Power Station site offer a significant opportunity to meet such a need and accordingly policies of the Plan should support such redevelopment. An exceptions clause is provided in Policy 5 for 100% Self and Custom Build Housing to be supported where it accords with the spatial strategy and other policies. This should be expanded to allow such developments on major previously developed sites. Policy 7 relating to Residential Care Homes should also include such a provision. Such sites have potential to offer a very real opportunity to provide such facilities in the form of self-sustaining extra care villages.	The next version of the Local Plan is expected to include several development management policies: one will include the efficient and effective use of land, such as brownfield land. Even so, the current draft Plan does not restrict development on brownfield sites. Policy 3 identifies the percentage of affordable homes expected to be sought as part of major development on brownfield sites. It is not considered necessary to include a specific policy on brownfield sites. A housing land availability assessment is being undertaken which would include an assessment of the Former Power Station site. This is considered to be the most appropriate approach for considering the development potential of this site.
DBLP221	B Weedall	Gladman Developments	Welcome the flexibility and proactive approach to meeting affordable housing needs. Only through positively planning for significant housing growth can the Council realistically tackle market signals advocated by the PPG and tackle the affordability and housing crisis. Elsewhere in the plan there are policies which could place requirements on sites over what normally be expected (which may have cost implications) and in addition to CIL and S.106, may wish to review whether the risk to affordable housing in circumstances of an acute shortage, is the appropriate balance. For example, there may be a situation where a more onerous policy requirement results in a viability case having to be run, which results in a lower affordable housing percentage rather than a relaxation in the policy requirement to more traditional standards that would enable a policy compliant level of affordable housing. Paragraph 7.13 refers to the Council undertaking a viability exercise for each site in order to confirm that the requisite affordable housing percentage would be viable. If the Council intends to complete this exercise for all of the proposed allocations then it is important that the policy requirements, infrastructure requirements and the likely S.106 and CIL costs are all factored in to the assessments. There will be the need to work alongside the promoter/landowner in order to understand any additional site specifics.	The Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Assessment provides an initial assessment of the viability implications of securing affordable housing, CIL, S106 contributions and other policy cost implications for a range of residential development typologies. This
DBLP226	B Barnett	Retford Civic Society	The number of affordable dwellings provided in recent development has been disappointing, because developers have challenged the viability of the present targets. The targets now proposed seem unduly low and it is lower than in many other plans around the country. Developers will never provide more than the target even if they could do so and still make a profit. If they buy land in the full knowledge that a higher target in the Local Plan has gone through the examination process it would be hard for them argue for an exemption or reduction on viability grounds. The target should be as high as the Council can show to be viable at a District wide level.	The Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Assessment identifies that the affordable housing requirements in Policy 3 are appropriate for the District and can be achieved as part of a viable development.
DBLP255	S Green	Home Builders Federation	Under Policy 3 sites of 10 or more dwellings or 5 or more dwellings in Designated Rural Areas on-site contributions will be required of 10% for brownfield and 20% for greenfield subject to viability. In circumstances where specific site viability is raised, the developer will be required to provide an Open Book Financial Viability Statement in accordance with Policy 23. It is noted that for sites of 5 or more dwellings in Designated Rural Areas commuted sum payments may be more appropriate than on-site provision as set out in the Written Ministerial Statement 28 November 2014. Under the 2019 NPPF the Local Plan should set out the level and type of affordable housing provision required together with other necessary infrastructure but such policies should not undermine the deliverability of the Local Plan (para 34). The cumulative burden of policy requirements should be set so that most development is deliverable without further viability assessment negotiations (para 57). It is the Council's responsibility to robustly viability test the Local Plan in order that the cumulative burden of policy requirements are set so that most development is deliverable without further viability assessment negotiations (para 57) and the deliverability of the Local Plan is not undermined (para 34). Viability assessment is highly sensitive to changes in its inputs whereby an adjustment or an error in any one assumption can have a significant impact on the viability or otherwise of development. It is important that the tests the influence of all inputs on viability as this determines if land is released for development. The final report should include detailed background evidence to substantiate used assumptions and to facilitate thorough examination of the Council's viability assessment by other parties.	The Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Assessment provides an initial assessment of the viability implications of securing affordable housing, CIL, S106 contributions and other policy cost implications for a range of residential development typologies. This assessment is being updated to inform the next version of the Local Plan. Further information on the requirements for Designated Rural Areas will be added to Policy 3.
DBLP273	J. Rogers	Friends of Woodlands and Coachwood Green Ltd	Residents of Shireoaks identified during the Neighbourhood plan development the desirability of maintain the desired property types in particular the need for more retirement bungalows and more affordable housing.	Policy 3 and Policy 4 seek to deliver a mix of housing types and affordable housing to meet local needs. The need is set out in the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment. A Neighbourhood Plan could also include a housing mix policy where there is evidence which demonstrates a requirement for a particular type of home in the neighbourhood plan area.
DBLP281	B Lange	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	The Local Plan does not comply with national planning guidance. The NPPF paragraph 62 "Where a need for affordable housing is identified, planning policies should specify the type of affordable housing required, and expect it to be met on-site unless: a) off-site provision or an appropriate financial contribution in lieu can be robustly justified; and b) the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities." Policy 3 does not adequately reflect the requirement for 'robust' justification of off-site provision or specify criteria regarding what Bassetlaw would regard as a justification. 3C weakens 2. The policy wording should be clearer and stronger setting out what Bassetlaw would regard as a justification and what as 'sufficient' evidence.	It is acknowledged that Policy 3 could better reflect the details of national policy and the content of the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The next version of the Local Plan will address the points raised.
Policy 4: Housing mix				
DBLP55	C O'Grady		Need more flats/apartments in the Bassetlaw area, as many single people are unable to afford the prices to rent/buy houses in Bassetlaw, other than council properties which are few. More flats/apartments would provide adequate housing for the District whilst not taking up as much land causing us to cut down trees and lose our parks/lands and such. There are many flats in the town centre but the parking is obviously an issue and many people want to stay in the villages in the surrounding areas where they have grown up where flats are not available. Many of the new houses being built are being built on smaller sections of land but still have many houses on, causing the houses to be small with no gardens. Looks like trying to cram as many houses as possible into tiny plots of land.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The district is very varied in terms of housing need and it is difficult to prescribe in any detail the type of housing which is required. The Council will utilise the evidence (e.g. SHMA or Neighbourhood Plans) available to inform planning decisions on housing mix.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Support the flexible approach taken to the provision of a mix of housing across the District. Must ensure that development proposals are appropriate to the local area and the context in which the application is made. It will not always be appropriate to provide a mix of housing across the spectrum of housing at every Site.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP142	M Malcolm	Ranskill Parish Council	Welcome the statement made in the Plan regarding housing mix, and understand that the Neighbourhood Plan can be used in this context would like to see a firm commitment from BDC to fulfilling local housing needs and note that the statement made on p55 "The Council does not wish to be prescriptive regarding the specific mix of properties to be built on sites as this is likely to be influenced by many factors, which may include viability" which appears to undermine what is said elsewhere in Policy 4. Concerned that the majority of houses recently given permission or proposed in Ranskill are for large 4/5 bedroomed properties which appear to be targeted at commuters. Does not wish to see Ranskill becoming a dormitory village for commuters and instead want to see accommodation for younger residents buying their first property or older residents seeking to downsize, alongside employment opportunities for Bassetlaw residents.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP173	J Cox	Lichfields on behalf of SP Scholey and the estate of WA Scholey	Agree with the ambition of Policy 4 to provide mix of housing on individual residential sites. As part of this, the Plan should look to allocate housing sites that, in accordance with its strategy for achieving economic growth, are capable of delivering both affordable and aspirational homes. Such is the case at Folly Nook Lane, Ranskill.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP221	B Weedall	Gladman Developments	Supportive the approach which seeks to provide a range of mix of housing types to meet the ever-growing needs of the District. In particular, support that the policy does not set out a prescriptive approach regarding the specific mix of properties. As acknowledged in the supporting text development proposals can be influenced by many factors and a criteria based approach should be used to meet the demand for market and affordable homes. Reference to Neighbourhood Plan policies should not be referenced in the text of the policy. The approach advocated by the Council is better suited to dealing with housing mix, tenures, types and sizes. If a Neighbourhood Plan were to come forward and sought to impose specific requirements in their neighbourhood area following the adoption of the Local Plan, then this would remove the flexibility provided by Policy 4.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Neighbourhood Plan groups are in a better position to analyse in more detail the housing needs of their area. Where NP's have included a policy on housing mix, the Council will require developments to meet the needs of the area. This will be reaffirmed in the policy.
DBLP317	987880		Support for housing mix policy. I wish more bungalows were built, there are lots of people like my husband and myself who wish to downsize.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP318	987892		Support for Mixed Housing policy. Please build more bungalows.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
Policy 5: Self and Custom Build Housing				
DBLP101	J Chatterton	William Davis Ltd	It is accepted that there is a requirement for the emerging Plan to accommodate self and custom build housing in accordance with section 1 of the Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 this must be based on a clear evidence of need and subject to applications held on record within a District Register. Self / custom build plots on larger housing allocations which only changes housing delivery from one form of house building to another without any clear justification is not supported. The Council should also analyse the preferences of these entries as often only individual plots in rural locations are sought as opposed to plots on larger housing sites. If serviced plots are not developed by self / custom builders then these undeveloped plots are effectively removed from the Housing Land Supply. Before introducing Policy 5 requiring a portion of all large sites to accommodate self/custom builds the Council should consider the practicalities of health & safety, working hours, length of build programme, etc. as well as viability assessing any adverse impacts. Moreover, allocating such plots will incur the loss of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions as self / custom build properties are exempt.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The policy does not require sites to deliver self or custom build plots. It simply states that the Council will support this if the developer is looking to deliver plots.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Welcome the support for self-build and custom housing where supported by other policies within the Local Plan.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP149	H Godley	Fisher German on behalf of D Thorlby	Objections to this policy, which looks to enforce the delivery of self/custom build housing as a proportion of estate developments. It is well established that such criteria are largely unworkable on modern housing developments and do not serve to provide additional units. In reality, such requirements may impede development unnecessarily, adding to developer burden without even delivering additional housing units. Self-builders do not want to buy serviced plots within or adjacent to a modern housing estate. Experience is that for the most part that they are instead looking for more bespoke rural opportunities. Some housebuilders provide a custom build option as part of their product, this cannot be expected across all sites and the sector as it may not be within the business model of many housebuilders. Such requirements could dissuade housebuilders from operating and delay development while policy requirements are negotiated. It is a further fallacy to consider that because there is demand self-build plots on a self-build register, that they would all build their own property, even if suitable land was available. The reality is the difficulty and lack of needed skills will mean only a small percentage of those on the register will ever develop a self-build property.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The policy does not require sites to deliver self or custom build plots. It simply states that the Council will support this if the developer is looking to deliver plots.
DBLP151	D Kitson	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	This market is growing evermore and is to be encouraged by this Council and it is pleasing to see it included in the draft plan. It follows on from strong guidance and advice from central government but in a recent Planning Committee meeting it was clear that senior Councillors neither support this policy nor believe it produces dwellings, rather the contrary. Local planning authorities are charged to keep registers showing self build plots available and applicants seeking such plots. These should be matched together so that development may proceed. It is wrong for the Council to have such a planning policy and for Councillors to have such a diverse view and use that diverse view to make decisions on applications. If this policy is to be adopted then it needs the full support of Councillors.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP158	H Godley	Fisher German on behalf of T Strawson and D Horrocks	Objections to this policy, which looks to enforce the delivery of self/custom build housing as a proportion of estate developments. It is well established that such criteria are largely unworkable on modern housing developments and do not serve to provide additional units. In reality, such requirements may impede development unnecessarily, adding to developer burden without even delivering additional housing units. Self-builders do not want to buy serviced plots within or adjacent to a modern housing estate. Experience is that for the most part that they are instead looking for more bespoke rural opportunities. Some housebuilders provide a custom build option as part of their product, this cannot be expected across all sites and the sector as it may not be within the business model of many housebuilders. Such requirements could dissuade housebuilders from operating and delay development while policy requirements are negotiated. It is a further fallacy to consider that because there is demand self-build plots on a self-build register, that they would all build their own property, even if suitable land was available. The reality is the difficulty and lack of needed skills will mean only a small percentage of those on the register will ever develop a self-build property.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The policy does not require sites to deliver self or custom build plots. It simply states that the Council will support this if the developer is looking to deliver plots.
DBLP195	J Beverley	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of The Holy and Undivided Trinity	Object to this policy, which looks to enforce the delivery of self/custom build housing as a proportion of estate developments. It is well established that such criteria are largely unworkable on modern housing developments and do not serve to provide additional units. In reality, such requirements may impede development unnecessarily, adding to developer burden without even delivering additional housing units. Self-builders do not want to buy serviced plots in or adjacent to a modern housing estate. For the most part that they are instead looking for more bespoke rural opportunities. While some housebuilders provide a custom build option as part of their product, this cannot be expected across all sites and the entire sector as it simply may not within the business model of many housebuilders. Such requirements could dissuade housebuilders from operating within the district and delay development while policy requirements are negotiated. It is a further fallacy to consider that because there is demand self-build plots on a self-build register, that they would all build their own property, even if suitable land was available. The reality is the difficulty and lack of needed skills will mean only a small percentage of those on the register will ever develop a self-build property.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The policy does not require sites to deliver self or custom build plots. It simply states that the Council will support this if the developer is looking to deliver plots.
DBLP221	B Weedall	Gladman Developments	Support inclusion of this policy but further clarity can be provided. From the stated information it is in rural locations where there appears to be the greatest demand for self-build plots, which are likely to be as part of small developments, but the policy advocates plots within larger developments. A greater amount of evidence is required and a clearer explanation included to demonstrate how the needs are reflected in this general policy and in the site allocations. It is evident that much of the demand may be location specific, which should also be taken into account and translated into policies. It is not apparent at this juncture whether 8% of the housing requirement (and an expectation that this will be mostly market self-build housing) reflects the actual needs for the plan period and that these needs could be addressed as part of the larger allocations at all.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The policy does not require sites to deliver self or custom build plots. It simply states that the Council will support this if the developer is looking to deliver plots.
DBLP245	P Bland		Some self and custom build housing applications are being made as a means of avoiding affordable housing. Strong conditions should be applied to ensure that properties built are genuinely occupied by the applicants for a minimum of five years. More consideration should be given to providing a safe and carefree environment by grouping appropriate housing types rather than ad hoc mix of housing types.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP273	J. Rogers	Friends of Woodlands and Coachwood Green Ltd	The importance of the separate rural identity of Shireoaks and Rhodessa villages as distinct from the neighbouring urban identity of the town of Workop. The recent extensive development of housing and industrial properties is blurring the boundaries and upsetting the desired balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas. The separation needs to be maintained and the differing characteristics encouraged to survive.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Plan is seeking to maintain the character of settlements. Policy 8 Rural Basetlaw has a strong focus on the retention of character in rural areas.
Policy 6: Specialist Housing				
DBLP101	J Chatterton	William Davis Ltd	In accordance with the 2015 Ministerial Statement specialist or adaptable housing should only be required through a Local Plan where there is an established and clear evidence of need. NPPF 2018 para 57 makes reference to planning applications that comply with up-to-date Local Plans should be assumed to be viable. Therefore, for the Plan to be found sound at examination stage, viability testing for required levels of on-site specialist housing must be undertaken. The evidence base for the Local Plan shows no viability assessment or justified need for the proposed requirement of 45% of on all dwellings on major sites to be accessible or 10% to of on-site homes to be wheelchair accessible to the M4(3) standard.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The 2017 SHMA provides evidence of a need for specialist housing. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment will review this policy to ensure that the requirements of Policy 6 can be achieved.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Object to Policy 6. The evidence relied on does not appear to match evidence now presented for the housing requirement. It is not clear what the evidence is for the requirement of a minimum of 45% of new dwellings on major development sites to be developed to the (optional) Building Regulations standard M4(2). Consider that the planning system should not seek to supersede the provisions of Building Regulations. Apply the same comments to Part 3 of Policy 6 which requires 10% of new dwellings on major development sites to meet Part M4(3) of the Building Regulations. It is not clear how the Council has sought to assess the impact of such requirements on the viability of major development schemes.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The 2017 SHMA provides evidence of a need for specialist housing. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment will review this policy to ensure that the requirements of Policy 6 can be achieved.
DBLP143	George Breed	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	Accept and support the need for a mix of housing to meet a range of needs, but it needs to be recognised that this has to be primarily market-led. Development will reflect unmet demand which will fluctuate over time. Policy should not seek to be overly prescriptive rather flexible to safeguard its relevance. If the Council wish to adopt the higher optional standards for Building Regulations Part M Category 2 accessible and adaptable homes (M4(2)) and Category 3 wheelchair user homes (M4(3)) then this should only be done in accordance with the 2018 NPPF (para 127f & Footnote 42). The Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) dated 25th March 2015 stated that "the optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the NPPG". The % of people aged over 65+ is increasing with the majority of existing property lacking Part M4(2) & (3) features like level approach routes, accessible front door thresholds, wider internal doorway and corridor widths, switches and sockets at accessible heights and downstairs toilet facilities usable by wheelchair users. Had the government considered the evidence of an aging population to be sufficient to warrant the higher M4(2) and M4(3) standard it would already be incorporated within Building Regulations. Before a higher standard can be considered by Basetlaw it must first provide up to date evidence demonstrating specific need. The requirement for M4(3) should only be required for dwellings over which the Council has housing nomination rights as set out in the NPPG (ID 56-008). Any requirement for higher optional standards especially M4(3) should be thoroughly viability tested.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The 2017 SHMA provides evidence of a need for specialist housing. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment will review this policy to ensure that the requirements of Policy 6 can be achieved.
DBLP149	H Godley	Fisher German on behalf of D Thorlby	Concerned by this policy's requirement that on major development sites, a minimum of 45% of dwellings must be assessable and a minimum of 10% must be wheelchair accessible. Whilst it is noted that the Council's SHMA Update (October 2017) identifies a need for 1,350 dwellings for older people, do not believe that the Council's rationale for why the implementation of 'higher building regulation standards' via this policy will help to secure these dwellings. It is not clear from the evidence base whether the financial implications of providing accessible dwellings has been fully understood to ensure that this will not place undue burden on developers. This policy (in addition to the policy of affordable housing) must take account of general issues with viability which are currently experienced in the District, especially if the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is to be continued.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment will review this policy to ensure that the requirements of Policy 6 can be achieved.
DBLP150	C Grainger		Not all older people want to go into care homes what they require are more bungalows. No developer will volunteer to build bungalows they take up more land which means lower profits. Would like to see the plan force developers building more than 10 properties, to be allocate a percentage to bungalows in the same way they have to affordable housing.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to work with developers in seeking to deliver the right type and mix of new homes. However, the Council cannot force developers to deliver bungalows.

DBLP151	D Kitson	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	Research has shown that there is a need for affordable housing and housing for the elderly in urban and rural areas. It is not always the case that affordable housing is required. The housing stock may well be adequate but the occupancy is the problem. Numerous family homes are occupied by senior citizens who cannot find a suitable smaller single storey bungalow to relocate into. If we provided more of this type of structure within both urban and rural locations it would inevitably release family homes back into the market. It is not simply a case of providing a definitive number of homes. Research could easily be undertaken through the Neighbourhood Plan process with a simple question or two:- 1. How many couples over the age of 55 live in family homes? 2. Of these couples, how many would relocate into a new bungalow in the same village or suburb? (thus keeping communities together which is very important). Aware that according to developers, bungalows are very expensive to build but then often developers do squeal the loudest - sometimes justifiably - if land prices remain high which they will if supply, particularly in rural areas, is limited. Of course it doesn't just have to be single storey. The Council used to provide 2 storey structures with a flat on the first floor for more able bodied couples/small families and the ground floor was dedicated as senior citizen accommodation. Such designs could be revisited if the need is proven. The proposed policies on all aspects of specialist housing appear to suggest that such housing will be mandatory on various sizes of sites and permission will only be granted if this provision is included. This approach does not consider the community issue that senior citizens often cling to. In social/community care circles often encouraged to bond with and visit elderly people who often do not see anyone they know. Moving such sensitive members of the public out of their known community group and locating them elsewhere because planning policy required 3 bungalows to be built in Mattersey (example) is not considerate. Encouragement rather than policies is required. Do the research and identify sites where senior citizen accommodation can be built then keep the community or at least some friends together. Such inclusions will undoubtedly put developers off and make certain sites unattractive.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to work with developers in seeking to deliver the right type and mix of new homes. Agree that the Neighbourhood Plan process is better suited to assessing the more detailed housing needs of the local community.
DBLP158	H Godley	Fisher German on behalf of T Strawson and D Horrocks	Concerned by this policy's requirement that on major development sites, a minimum of 45% of dwellings must be assessable and a minimum of 10% must be wheelchair accessible. Whilst it is noted that the Council's SHMA Update (October 2017) identifies a need for 1,350 dwellings for older people, do not believe that the Council's rationale for why the implementation of 'higher building regulation standards' via this policy will help to secure these dwellings. It is not clear from the evidence base whether the financial implications of providing accessible dwellings has been fully understood to ensure that this will not place undue burden on developers. This policy (in addition to the policy of affordable housing) must take account of general issues with viability which are currently experienced in the District, especially if the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is to be continued.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. This policy will be assessed through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Amendments will be made where necessary.
DBLP169	I Herring	Avant Homes (Central) and Wyndthorpe Developments Ltd	Sets a prescriptive requirement for sites of 10 or more dwellings to provide for a minimum of 45% of dwellings to meet (M4(2)) standards and a minimum of 10% of dwellings to meet (M4(3)) standards. Not reflected in the Council's Interim Whole Plan and Viability Study, which has benchmarked viability assumptions on the basis of 10% of dwellings to meet M4(2) standards and 4% of dwellings to meet M4(3) standards. It is noted that the viability study only assumes a marginal cost of £1-2 per m² to meet M4(2) standards and £4 per m² to meet M4(3) standards respectively. Refer the Council to previous work undertaken by EC Harris during the Government's Housing Standards Review, to which the cost impact of M4(3) was estimated at around £26,816 per dwelling, significantly above the cost inputs assumed in this instance. It is vital that the plan wide viability is robustly assessed and as per the requirements of the NPPF, policies should not undermine the deliverability of the plan nor should policy requirements require further viability testing at application stage. It is imperative that any policy expectations are accurately reflected within the plan viability study, as failure to properly assess the impact of such requirements puts the deliverability of the plan requirement at risk.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. This policy will be assessed through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Amendments will be made where necessary.
DBLP175	A Child	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	The section is confusing - in some places it deals with application of the optional technical standards and the need to provide bespoke specialist housing for the elderly such as retirement schemes and extra care schemes (as listed in the policy) as "one and the same". There is a need to consider the need for accessible housing as part of wider development and the need to provide purpose built specialist older persons housing options separately. Reinforced by the SHMA which considers specialist housing and wheelchair accessible housing separately and presents different figures for application through policy. If this is not done, it may prevent the needed specialist housing options from coming forward.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The policy is considered to be appropriate for the delivery of housing to meet the needs of people with accessibility restrictions, subject to assessment through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.
DBLP175	A Child	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	States: The Government is very keen to see Local Authorities addressing the needs of the older people in terms of housing type, design and delivery. In seeking to address this, the Government has published a series of optional technical standards. Government is keen to address the needs of older people. NPPG Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment and in respect to the delivery of housing to meet the needs of older people states: The need to provide housing for older people is critical as people are living longer lives and the proportion of older people in the population is increasing. The age profile of the population can be drawn from Census data. Projection of population and households by age group can also be used. Strategic policy-making authorities will need to consider the size, location and quality of dwellings needed in the future for older people in order to allow them to live independently and safely in their own home for as long as possible, or to move to more suitable accommodation if they so wish. Supporting independent living can help to reduce the costs to health and social services, and providing more options for older people to move could also free up houses that are under occupied. (emphasis added) There is a need to address this through specialist housing for older people. Wheelchair accessibility will not achieve what is required by the NPPG. The reference in Para 7.23 "in seeking to address this" suggests otherwise. It is recommended that this reference be deleted	Thank you for your comments which are noted. It is not considered necessary to remove "in seeking to address this" from paragraph 7.23. A combination of measures are required to address the needs of older people. This is just one way the Government is seeking to address this issue.
DBLP175	A Child	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	Provides a calculation for a reduced requirement for specialist housing for older people based on a reduced timeframe of the Local Plan and the delivery of 50 units. The undersupply for the last four years (50 bungalows against the target of 67 x 4 = 268) means the annual requirement is higher. It is recommended that this annual requirement is stated to underline the need to address provision and to assist in monitoring	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP175	A Child	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	Paragraph 7.28 sets out that new housing developments will need to provide specialist housing but Paragraph 7.29 immediately goes on to state: "The Council considers that the best way to achieve this is through the implementation of the higher building regulation standards on a percentage of new homes". The approach is wrong. The Plan needs to consider the need for, and provide for, where that need is identified for specialist housing for older people such as Retirement Housing and Extra Care and separately for accessible housing. Para 7.29 suggests that such schemes will only be supported where they come forward as part of larger developments. Most bespoke schemes are more likely to come forward through windfall and brownfield developments on sites close to existing town centres but face a number of difficulties in doing so. Para 7.29 needs to be amended to provide support for this. Recommended that para 7.28 is prefaced as: "The development of specialist housing for older people including retirement schemes and Extra Care Housing will be supported". Para 7.29 should be amended by the deletion of the first sentence, namely "The Council considers that the best way to achieve this is through the implementation of the higher building regulation standards on a percentage of new homes".	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Proposed to amend the wording "the best way to achieve this" to "one way to achieve this".
DBLP175	A Child	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	A new sentence should be added at the beginning of the Policy as: "The development of specialist housing for older people including retirement schemes and Extra Care Housing will be supported	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP192	B Lomas	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	Proposes a minimum of 45% of dwellings on major development sites to be accessible (M4(2) Building Regulations) and a minimum of 10% of dwellings on major development sites to be wheelchair accessible (M4(3) Building Regulations). This appears an inflexible and rigid requirement and request that flexibility is built into the policy. The Council are required by the WMS dated 25th March 2015 to provide clearly evidenced need for adopting the higher optional standards. It is not clear from the justifying text where the minimum 45% and 10% requirements are derived. Further justification is required. The viability impacts of this policy requirement needs to be understood. Note the HBF concerns with this policy and reserve the right to make further comments at later iterations.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The 2017 SHMA update provides evidence to support this policy. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment will assess the policy and amendments will be made where necessary.
DBLP195	J Beverley	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of The Holy and Undivided Trinity	Concerned by this policy's requirement that on major development sites, a minimum of 45% of dwellings must be assessable and a minimum of 10% must be wheelchair accessible. Note that the Council's SHMA Update (October 2017) identifies a need for 1,350 dwellings for older people, do not believe the Council's rationale for why the implementation of 'higher building regulation standards' via this policy will help to secure these dwellings. It is not clear from the evidence base whether the financial implications of providing accessible dwellings has been fully understood to ensure that this will not place undue burden on developers. This policy (in addition to the policy of affordable housing) must take account of general issues with viability which are currently experienced in the District, especially if the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is to be continued.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment will assess the policy and amendments will be made where necessary.

DBLP221	B Weedall	Gladman Developments	It would be beneficial to confirm whether this policy means that 55% of major development sites should be to M4(2). In principle, recognise the importance of delivering housing to assist in meeting the needs for older people and those with mobility issues. However, the NPPF is clear that planning policies for housing should make use of the Government's optional technical standards for accessible and adaptable housing only if this would address an identified need for such policies and where these standards can be justified. Refers to the PPG which provides guidance on the use of the optional technical standards. Will need to ensure through its evidence that Policy 6 is in line with the guidance and that the justification and specific detail of the policy take account of the various factors which the PPG refers to: "Based on their housing needs assessment and other available datasets it will be for the local planning authority to set out how they intend to approach the need for Requirement M4(2) (accessible and adaptable dwellings), and/or M4(3) (wheelchair user dwellings), of the Building Regulations. There is a wide range of published official statistics and factors which local planning authorities can consider and take into account, including: - The likely future need for older and disabled people (including wheelchair user dwellings); - Size, location, type and quality of dwellings needed to meet specifically evidenced needs (for example retirement homes, sheltered homes, or care homes); - The accessibility and adaptability of existing stock; - How needs vary across different tenures; and - The overall impact of viability." The application of M4(3) standards should only be required for dwellings that the Council is solely responsible for as required by the PPG. These technical standards have deliberately been set as optional standards which, if to be included as a policy in the Local Plan, would need to be justified by robust evidence that is based on more than an age profile. It is accepted that evidence suggests an ageing population in the district, this does not justify the use of optional building regulations to such high percentages. When reconsidering this policy, the Council need to be aware of the impact that these requirements can have on the costs of construction (per dwelling) and scheme viability and the knock-on effects that this could have on the delivery of much needed housing (and potentially affordable housing levels through viability issues). Flexibility in the policy wording should be included which provides 'support' for provision of M4(2) but does not set a policy requirement which could impact development viability to the detriment of affordable housing delivery. Would object to this policy as the percentages are not sound and/or supported by robust and detailed evidence on the accessibility needs. Similarly, it would not appear that the Council have properly considered the additional cost implications for housing with these requirements within the viability work. The viability assessment only tested on the basis of 10% M4(2) and 4% of M4(3) at a cost assumption of £1.2 per square meter and £4 per square meter respectively. Through the Government's Housing Standards Review EC Harris estimated the cost impact of M4(3) per dwelling as £15,691 for apartments and £26,816 for houses. It will also be necessary to consider the relative priorities in meeting affordable housing and/or meeting M4(2) and M4(3) needs and how this translates into the policies. Similarly, where M4(2) and M4(3) requirements will be met through schemes of specialist accommodation for older people then the needs for allocations should be reduced accordingly. Given the age profile, a more appropriate strategy to meet the needs would be to properly understand the detailed needs across the range of specialist accommodation types and then allocate sufficient sites to meet these needs. Any percentages to achieve the optional building regulation standards should take account of the delivery of that accommodation, which will have to comply with those standards in order to be fit for purpose anyway. Given that the housing requirement is 6,630 it would be unreasonable to impose more onerous requirements on the allocations to make up for the fact that around 50% of the requirement is already committed without these requirements. It may be beneficial to consider how other Councils have addressed these matters within recently adopted Local Plans. Policy 6 should also be subdivided as it relates to 2 different requirements, one being the need for specialist accommodation and the other for accessible homes as part of the residential allocations.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing this policy, taking into consideration the results of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. Amendments will be made where it is considered necessary.
DBLP226	B Barnett	Retford Civic Society	Welcomes the higher standards of internal access in dwellings. The population is aging and more people will need homes designed to accommodate impaired mobility.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP255	S Green	Home Builders Federation	Policy 6 on sites of 10 or more dwellings a minimum of 45% of dwellings must meet Building Regulations Part M Category 2 accessible and adaptable homes (M4(2)) standards and a minimum of 10% of dwellings must meet Building Regulations Part M Category 3 wheelchair user homes (M4(3)) standards. If the Council wishes to adopt the higher optional standards for M4(2) and M4(3) then this should be done in accordance with the 2019 NPPF (para 127f & Footnote 46). The WMS 25th March 2015 stated that "the optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the NPPG". Footnote 46 of 2019 NPPF states that planning policies for housing should make use of the Government's optional technical standards for accessible and adaptable housing where this would address an identified need for such properties. The Council should apply the criteria set out in the NPPG (ID 56-005 to 56-011). Should gather evidence to determine whether there is a need for additional standards in their area and justify setting appropriate policies in the Local Plan. In determining the quantum of M4(2) and /or M4(3) homes the Council should focus on the ageing population living in the District compared to national / regional figures and the proportion of households living in newly built homes. All new homes are built to Building Regulation Part M Category 1 (M4(1)) standards which include level approach routes, accessible front door thresholds, wider internal doorway and corridor widths, switches and sockets at accessible heights and downstairs toilet facilities usable by wheelchair users. These standards are not usually available in the older existing housing stock (if built circa more than 10 years ago) and benefit less able-bodied occupants. The population aged 65+ in Bassetlaw is increasing but if the Government had intended that evidence of an ageing population justified adoption of the higher M4(2) and M4(3) optional standards then such standards would have been incorporated as mandatory in the Building Regulations which the Government has not done. It is incumbent on the Council to provide a local assessment evidencing the specific case for Bassetlaw which justifies the inclusion of optional higher standards and the quantum in Policy 6. As set out in the 2019 NPPF all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence which should be adequate and proportionate focussed tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned (para 31). The Council is reminded that the requirement for M4(3) should only be required for dwellings over which the Council has housing nomination rights as set out in the NPPG (ID 56-008). Any requirement for higher optional standards especially M4(3) should be thoroughly viability tested. In September 2014 Government's Housing Standards Review EC Harris estimated the cost impact of M4(3) per dwelling as £15,691 for apartments and £26,816 for houses. The Council's viability assessment only tested on the basis of 10% M4(2) and 4% M4(3) at a cost assumption of £1 – 2 per square metre and £4 per square metre respectively. This policy requirement should be modified before publication of the pre-submission Local Plan.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council's 2017 SHMA Update indicates a need for accessible and adaptable homes and this forms reasoned justification for Policy 6. In terms of viability, the Council will ensure that all relevant policies, including policy 6, are included in the whole plan viability assessment. The Council will make any necessary amendments to the policy taking into consideration evidence in the whole plan viability assessment.
DBLP265	S Chandler		With an increasing aging population missing a golden opportunity to lead the way by ensuring that the older generation of Bassetlaw is cared for by creating a retirement village where bungalow and facilities are considered at one of the possible development sites, thus freeing up larger family homes, filling the need for a variety of sized bungalow.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP284	N Ward	Doncaster Council	Support inclusion of the optional building Regulations revolved around the M4(2) and M4(3) accessibility standards, and feel the policy is appropriate to improve the quality of new homes and better housing choices for disadvantaged groups in the region. The evidence provided in the "North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Strategic Housing Market Area OAN Update" is appropriate with regards to the robust evidence base required in the NPPG (NPPG para 007, Ref ID 56-007-20150327). This evidence has the potential to be strengthened further through looking at some of the other appropriate sources outlined in the Government's guide to disability data. From assessing Bassetlaw's "Interim Whole Plan & CIL Viability Assessment 2018", it seems that a lower percentage than what is included in the policy was used for the appraisal assumptions. To make sure the policy adheres to the viability assessment requirement in the NPPG, any update to the viability assessment should reflect the percentage of accessible housing outlined in the policy as a minimum. The wording reflecting the inclusion of the M4(3) wheelchair accessible standards should be reassessed. This is in light of the two different distinctions of the M4(3) standard and the wording in the NPPG which states that Plan policies for wheelchair accessible homes should be applied only to those dwellings where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating a person to live in that dwelling (NPPG para 009, Ref ID 56-009-20150327). For the policy to be applicable to private market dwellings, the policy should ask for the requirement of wheelchair adaptable dwellings.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. In terms of viability, the Council will ensure that all relevant policies, including policy 6, are included in the whole plan viability assessment. The Council will make any necessary amendments to the policy taking into consideration evidence in the whole plan viability assessment.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Housing Mix and Policy 4 – Mixes of housing types based on needs / local evidence, but also must meet the requirements of the applicable Neighbourhood Plan.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Can only be satisfied by major developments for the old, disabled, wheelchair accessible need. Unless a specific individual is building for his / her own / family member sole use.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
Policy 7: Residential Care Homes				
DBLP221	B Weedall	Gladman Developments	Consider that the Council should consider the full range of specialist accommodation that falls in a C2 Residential Institution Use Class and seek to allocate sufficient sites across these different models that is commensurate with a detailed needs study in suitable locations. At para 7.33 the Council state that the affordable policies will meet the needs of Bassetlaw but as stated previously the level of housing proposed and the proposed policy levels for affordable housing, will not meet the affordable needs of Bassetlaw as per the Strategic Objectives.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP245	P Bland		Where residential homes are required it would be more appropriate to build in proximity of amenities such as hospitals.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
Policy 8: Rural Bassetlaw				
DBLP1	Mr Geronimo		All past development in Tuxford has been carried out to the other side of the town which has brought lots of congestion all in one area of town. Strongly believe that the future development should come to the south of the town to balance it out including my site No 124 which is a brownfield site and which has no topsoil (tests have been done) as the original use for the site was a brick yard. My views as to why the site is very suitable to be developed. 1. It is close to the windmill to which is the main local and tourist attraction and it would bring the town together. 2. It is one of the main bus routes. 3. It has full access to the countryside. 4. It will bring more integration into the neighbourhood. 5. All the main services are on site. Site location plan attached.	Tuxford Town Council has prepared a Neighbourhood Plan and are now in the process of reviewing it to consider locations for new development. Recent consultation with people in Tuxford stated that they would like to see a balance of new development around the town.
DBLP23	Mrs A Pacey		There are too many houses in the small villages when there are no amenities. People have to travel to town for everything i.e. supermarkets, banks, petrol, schools, doctors, post office - the list is endless and is adding greatly to global warming. There is nothing for young people, older and the infirm. They cannot get to town in the evening because there are no public transport.	The majority of new development will be in the three main towns where it is considered most sustainable. However, Rural parts of Bassetlaw will also be encouraged to grow to help meet housing needs in those areas and to support existing services and employment.
DBLP23	Mrs A Pacey		Those houses should be put in Retford, Worksop, Harworth, affordable ones where there is work, thus saving global warming. These houses should be affordable for all. They will also have all the amenities.	The majority of new development will be in the three main towns where it is considered most sustainable. However, Rural parts of Bassetlaw will also be encouraged to grow to help meet housing needs in those areas and to support existing services and employment.
DBLP26	Mr P Smith		As a joint owner of land in Styrrup welcome the changes this plan is recommending and feel a more positive approach to planning in rural settlements is well overdue. By allowing villages to grow it can bring opportunity with it in regards to supporting and enhancing local services and the increase in revenue for local businesses, whilst recognising the need for more homes as populations increase.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP31	Clir J Ogle		The risk of death and serious injury is HIGH RISK in and between the rural villages. Policy 8 to increase village and rural housing has been put forward without a risk assessment. There is serious dangers on country roads inadequate for modern traffic but lethal for increased numbers of residents. More people should not be put at risk by unsuitable roads which were not designed for safe modern living.	When considering the level and distribution of new development relevant infrastructure providers such as the Highway Authority are consulted. In terms of detailed highway issues and improvement, these will be detailed and agreed through any planning application process.
DBLP31	Clir J Ogle		The approach is a complete reversal of the previous plan in sustainability in the Rural Areas and villages. Previously development was unsustainable in the rural villages. Many residents are old people and the services and care that they require are not easily or safely provided in rural areas. The roads are historic having been created for horses with many bends and features especially in bad weather. Many health workers in Retford are not comfortable driving on dangerous roads in bad weather. The roads have a higher incidence of accidents, injuries and deaths. The parish Councils tend to concentrate on the village streets it is the roads between the villages that claim the most lives because the vehicles are travelling at speed between villages. Safety on the roads has not been taken into account in the new approach. In Heaton there has been 3 deaths on a junction on the Rampton Road outside the village in my lifetime - no improvements have been made. Other residents have been killed on rural roads e.g. at Cottam. Increasing traffic on these roads is going to increase deaths and injuries and this has not been taken into account in the sustainability policy.	The change in approach is largely in response to some communities asking for growth where it has been constrained in the past. In addition, a number of communities are positively planning for new development through the development of Neighbourhood Plans.
DBLP35	M Barden	Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	The parishes welcome the opportunity for sensitive planning applications in Dunham, Darlton and for the first time Ragnall. It is understood that any application would have to comply with existing or new guidelines, however for rural communities such as ours welcome the chance for limited new development in order that villages continue to thrive.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP56	C Hill	Gainsborough Town Council	Disappointed to not find more reference and ambition for development of the A631 given the significance of the route and volume of traffic. It is a major route to the coast and provides linkages to the A1, given the lifespan of the draft plan very concerned not to see any content in relation to development of this road.	The A631 form part of the Transport Study which is part of the Local Plan evidence base. The transport and traffic issues have been assessed through this document.
DBLP59	G Holland	Styrrup with Oldcotes Parish Council	The Villages of Oldcotes and Styrrup have been "no growth" villages since at least 1978 and to now suggest they are limited growth (subject to policy) is a nonsense. Both villages lack adequate facilities, schools, doctors and shops, and Styrrup has inadequate drainage to sustain any further growth. The Parish Council does not accept the figures derived for unmet need WITHIN the villages given the substantial housing developments at Harworth, Langold and Carlton in Lindrick. To classify Oldcotes and Styrrup in the same category as Langold from a growth perspective is a nonsense and ill thought out.	The level of growth has been distributed to settlements across rural Bassetlaw that are considered sustainable to see some limited development. There is an opportunity for the community in Styrrup and Oldcotes to plan for this development appropriately
DBLP81	J Pope	GPS Planning and Design Ltd	Agree that Scrooby should rightfully be included in the list of settlements at Figure 8 where growth is supported. Whilst we concur that there should be minimum housing requirement set for each of the rural settlements, it is our opinion that a precise quantum 'cap' for housing growth, in the case of Scrooby at 25 units, is far too restrictive.	the development of 25 units equals a 20% increase in dwellings which is consistent with other settlements within rural bassetlaw.
DBLP85	V Brabham		Normanton on Trent needs more new housing to keep its school viable. It is wrong just to allocate a set number to our village, there is loads of infill space. Over the last 10 years far more family properties have been built but we still need a few more and a designated park area would be great. Many new residents travel to London to work, our "widows row" - almshouses, now house younger people, the demographics have totally changed. Well aware Rampton hospital, one of the largest employers in Bassetlaw is struggling to attract staff. Why not consider the brown site of the now disused high marnham power station as a new village? It has good links to A1. It would be possible to cycle there at that distance, very green! Finally if any large development is allowed anywhere in this part of Bassetlaw, please make the developer bring us all mains gas!	Normanton on Trent is supported to grow up to a 20% increase in residential dwellings. Bassetlaw District Council are encouraging communities to undertake Neighbourhood Plans so that the local community can have a greater say in where the development is located and the type of development needed. The Local Plan is also considering the appropriate uses for existing brownfield sites such as High Marnham Power Station.
DBLP92	Mrs M Buckley		As a joint owner of land in Styrrup would welcome the changes this plan is recommending, and feel a more positive approach to planning in rural settlements is well over due. By allowing villages to grow, it can bring opportunity with it, in regards to supporting and enhancing local services and the increase in revenue for local businesses, whilst recognising the need for more homes as populations increase.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP101	J Chatterton	William Davis Ltd	Intends to place 1,777 homes delivered in the rural areas. For the minimum target to be delivered the rural areas would have to provide 105 dwellings per annum, with the draft Plan stating the average number of rural homes delivered each year for the previous 8 years to be only 92. The Bassetlaw AMR (March 2017) shows, within Table 4, that the average number of homes delivered per annum within rural areas for the years 2005-2010 to be as low as 55. The draft Plan is extremely ambitious and there is no certainty that the target is achievable within the Plan Period. The Draft Plan acknowledges this, stating within the 8 Neighbourhood Plans under development, 7 show shortfalls against the residual requirement; the largest of which being with the Parish of Langold, showing a shortfall of 94 dwellings against the required growth target. Policy 8 envisages the use of windfall sites to be a catalyst for development within the rural settlements, with single housing proposals of no more dwellings than 5% of any settlement emerging to provide a minimum of 10% growth to each Village. This would require 2 separate sites to be proposed, allocated and built out within each settlement by 2035. This is a complex and difficult strategy to successfully deliver as there are a number of existing limitations to development within rural settlements. Vast areas north of Retford, west of Gainsborough and east of Tuxford are within Floodzone 3 which limits and prohibits development within the affected settlements. Moreover, the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (2009) emphasises conservation upon two large swathes to the East and South West of the District further constraining development potential; there is also Clumber Park which will affect development potential for nearby and surrounding settlements. Beyond this, a general lack of facilities, amenities and infrastructure, as well as existing conservation areas, listed buildings and tightly drawn limits are restrictive on the growth potential for smaller settlements. If development were to come forward successfully and deliver on target this would provide up to 356 new affordable homes within the rural areas in accordance with Policy 3. Villages and smaller settlements are far less sustainable and have a weaker public transport network than the main towns of the District. New residents would have less access to employment, facilities and education as well as having a reliance on the private car. The Bassetlaw Sustainability Appraisal (January 2019) states the objective of 27% rural growth will impact negatively upon cultural heritage, landscape, transport, air quality and climate change as the increase in residential development in rural settlements will increase pressure on already limited rural transport services and could lead to increased traffic congestion and air pollution within rural communities (para 4.22). Focusing development across a range of more isolated and less well serviced locations is not in accordance with the overarching goal of sustainability within NPPF para 8. Suggest that based on past delivery trends an acceptable, achievable and sustainable housing target for the rural areas would be around 75 dpa. This would deliver 1,275 homes across the rural areas throughout the Plan Period. The remaining 502 homes should then be allocated and directed towards the sustainable town of Worksop.	The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.
DBLP129	Sara Stillard	Sturton le Steeple Parish Council	Sturton le Steeple broadly accepts the proposed target of between 10 and 20% growth till 2035. However, the benchmark for this calculation is not clear. There is at present planning permission for 10 houses, plus three others built in the last 2 years. Can you please clarify a) what is the cut-off date for recently built houses to be included in the baseline for calculating the 20% value and b) will houses built after that date be included in the overall 20% future development.	The 20% increase in dwellings is based on the number of existing dwellings in the parish as of August 2018. In addition, any new residential dwellings permitted since 1st April 2018 will contribute towards meeting the 20% requirement.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Object to the approach taken to the planning for the rural areas of Bassetlaw. Have significant concerns in relation to the overall quantum of development that has been directed towards the District's villages. Para 8.3 sets out the logic behind the approach to allocating development towards the rural area which has evolved from the "Functional Cluster" approach from the Initial Draft. Note that the overall allocation of development for the rural area (1,777 dwellings) is based on the minimum 10% being achieved at all of the 73 villages identified as being appropriate for growth. The premise by which the Local Plan has sought to allocate development is flawed. Support the need to maintain the viability and vitality of rural services, this needs to be planned for by understanding the health and hinterlands of those services and the level of development that is needed to support them (and through locating that level of development in a location accessible to those services). This assessment is true where a village cluster is located adjacent to or even around a main service centre. Many of the 73 villages identified for growth do not have any notable services to meet their day to day needs. Whilst they may form part of a 'cluster' that could access a GP Surgery in another village or a convenience shop in another, this does not constitute a sustainable pattern of living. It is not sustainable to encourage more households to live in remote locations where they are encouraged to travel in sporadic patterns to access remote facilities. It is much more sustainable for those villages to be sustained by their rural hubs (the main settlements) where trips can be linked and journeys made by public transport. Taking the Retford village cluster, of the 8 settlements in the cluster there are 2 villages which have services that might reasonably sustain some of the day to day needs of their populations. Clarbrough has a shop, post office and a primary school. Sutton-cum-Lound has a post office and a primary school. Ranby has a primary school. Support a level of development in those villages that would support the longer-term viability and vitality of those services. Development should relate to the settlement itself. It is not a forgone conclusion that those services would benefit from additional development; for example, Clarbrough School is already significantly over its capacity (163 pupils within a school of 140 capacity) and Ranby School is at capacity (110 pupils). Aside from Clarbrough (which has its own constraints regarding school capacity to overcome) and Sutton-cum-Lound there are no other settlements in the cluster that would benefit from additional development. Additional development in other villages where no services exist would not benefit the viability of the small service villages above, but simply locate more development within relatively unsustainable locations away from either rural services or main town settlements. In the Retford cluster, can see no evidence to suggest that residents of surrounding villages will not simply commute into Retford to meet their day to day needs. Note that the cluster of villages does not include a GP Surgery. The Retford Cluster is proposed to be allocated some 184 dwellings as a minimum with 82 of those allocated towards Clarbrough and Suttoncum-Lound. Some 100 dwellings will be allocated to the detriment of the sustainability of the borough, away from services and facilities that are provided within Retford. This pattern of allocation is repeated across the District.	The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Object to Policy 8 as it proposed a minimum allocation of 1777 dwellings to the rural villages. The plan will direct a significant amount of housing to the least sustainable locations within the borough and will not enhance their sustainability but increase the number of homes which are located unsustainably. The Council should abandon its policy of allocating a minimum level of development across the majority of its rural villages and should, target a modest level of growth to villages with existing services and facilities that require support to maintain their existing levels of vitality and viability. It is not clear why Part 1 of Policy 8 goes on to enable development to come forward on non-allocated sites outside the settlement boundary when this is not a policy mechanism used elsewhere within the Local Plan at more sustainable locations for growth (such as the three main settlements). The above approach, twinned with a 'cap' on the development that is double the minimum requirement (20% of the existing settlement) could lead to over 50% of the district's development being located within the rural area, away from jobs, services and facilities. Strongly object to this being a sustainable approach to planning.	The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.
DBLP142	M Malcolm	Ranskill Parish Council	With regard to Ranskill the Parish Council notes that the 10% cap is 60 houses the 20% cap 119 properties, that we already have 48 planning permissions granted which gives an outstanding figure for growth of 71 dwellings.	Any permissions for residential development granted after 1st April 2018 will contribute towards the 20% requirement for Ranskill.

DBLP143	George Breed	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	Past delivery of homes in Bassetlaw rural settlements over the past 8 years has averaged circa 100 homes per annum. It is unclear from the available evidence whether the Local Plan is right to align its Spatial Policies (27% of housing or 1777 homes) with past organic market led development. Unclear how the perpetuation of rural intensification is maximising sustainability? The homes being sold in rural communities are typically less affordable, reduce opportunities for modal shift away from car dependency, dilute village character, residents may struggle with poor access to essential services and often stretched local infrastructure. Rural intensification appears contrary to broad sustainable principles.	The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.
DBLP145	J Favill		Appreciate that the 10% housing increase and 20% cap is an across the district starting figure for identified settlements, strongly believe that Clayworth is too small a village with a uniquely well and seldom seemed preserved village layout, community and architectural heritage to be able to support these figures of increased housing. Clayworth is a unique conservation village, in a conservation setting and landscape. It is special in that farms and open spaces mix in with residential in a way rarely found in most Bassetlaw villages. Infill and suburban development styles have taken too much away from too many villages already in the district. To have development on the scale proposed would have a permanent negative impact on the village, its sense of place and special nature. Some of the sites previously suggested in 2017 for housing allocation are completely inappropriate. The field identified in the centre of the village, which lies alongside the village hall, is a unique breathing space in the linear ribbon structure of the village. It provides views over the farming landscape to which the village is intricately wedded, both historically and currently. It is a link to the canal, which encircles the village and for which the village setting is known for, bringing in many visitor, walkers and wildlife enthusiasts. When walking on the canal, and onto the public footpath that runs across this field and the grass field beyond, can look from the footpath into this field and onto the beautiful old cottages beyond, on the opposite side of the road to this field's edge and gateway. To build here would ruin this natural view that links the community, village and surrounding to its landscape and heritage. It would ruin a local and widely known rambling route and the cottages facing this field would face development completely out of keeping and context to their vernacular architecture. Would like to point out that do not live near this field or any these areas of the village. What safeguards are to be put in place to ensure any new development is for the benefit of village families and their children? Any development without it seems only to benefit district housing targets and not the village and villagers of Clayworth. Building without safeguarding and restricting access to new homes for village families is wrong and severely taking advantage of the village community. Large 'executive' and 'town house' style homes are not required for Clayworth, nor would they benefit villagers. They would simply serve to draw in wealthy people from outside the village, who are probably at a later stage of their life and have no housing needs whatsoever. Have neither a school nor a shop. Where are families to send their children to school, should new homes be built? The good village schools nearby are all at capacity and to assume parents would want to simply send their children to the catchment primary school in Clarborough is naive. Can even Clarborough school cope? The 'main road' through the village narrows significantly as one heads from the Retford end to the northern end of the village. Housing figures on this scale, and on the sites previously submitted in 2017, would dramatically increase the amount of traffic on the road and create significant road safety issues. Walking with children or in a group is already difficult and with added risk where the pavements are narrow, in and around the end of the village with the church especially. As a mother with two young children that increased volumes of traffic on the B road running through the village, alongside very narrow pavements with bends which fit a village rooted in an ancient layout, will only lead to awful accidents. Increased volumes of traffic would make walking far more dangerous and drastically impact on the rural and peaceful nature of the village. Access points onto the village's roads are often dangerous and with poor visibility. Development would increase the risk of accidents. Increased road signage, or safety features that currently aren't necessary but would be with development, would negatively impact on the rural nature of the village and would fly in the face of the conservation status. The issue lies in the overall setting, village-scape and its setting within its heritage and landscape. Increased housing in so many areas of the village would have far reaching negative impacts that would permanently impact on the village, its heritage and its community. The quality of any development is also a concern. Too much new housing is simply 'shoved in' and looks like something that has been dropped on a village site. Such developments are from a house builder's pattern book, with no consideration for local vernacular architecture and no effort whatsoever to create something unique and complementary for the village in which these developments have 'landed'. Clayworth deserves better. The village sits within a natural dip or shallow 'valley', bordered by Gringley beacon on one side, Haughgate Hill on the Wheatley side, Clayworth Common and finally the Chesterfield Canal, which forms a loop around the village. From all these vantage points and from aspects closer to and within the village, the village's ribbon development is clearly seen and fits within its landscape of agriculture fields and woodland, all of which are immediately accessible from this ribbon development along Town Street, to necessitate the agricultural economy upon which the village is founded. To break from this ribbon development with a lump of housing would jar with the settlement pattern. It would negatively impact on the ancient feel to the village and its natural flow northwards up towards the church at the top of Town Street. This is an ancient end of the village - walkers, visitors and locals find themselves naturally drawn and needs to be conserved. The village has SSSI along the Chesterfield Canal. It has a great deal of wildlife and varied nature biodiversity that has been able to coexist alongside its human population for centuries. Barn owls, short eared owls, cuckoos, swifts, grass snakes, ancient colonies of bats are heard and seen in and around the village. Grass snakes are spotted in the summer on the pavement verges of town street. There must be consideration of the village's natural environment and its biodiversity. It needs conserving. Some of the grass fields suggested for	The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.
DBLP150	C Grainger		Support developing rural areas in line with their Neighbourhood plans.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP151	D Kitson	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	This policy follows the traditional route of previous policy concerned with rural housing but if, as predicted, the reliance, provision and general use of petrol/diesel cars is to be drastically reduced in the near future, it does not really matter where housing is sited as the trips to and from the schools etc will be via sustainable transport methods. One aspect that continues to be ignored is the fact that most services, groceries, libraries, pharmacy, hairdressers, hot food, nearly all the day to day requirements are now delivered so the travel journeys to town are more to do with work and school and some social. These visits are reduced even more when one considers senior citizens as they have all retired and none of them have children at school. A rethink is therefore required. Figure 7 gives a list of villages where growth is not to be supported, primarily due to their size and location being away from service provisions and having none within the village. This description is generally correct but Bevercotes is a glaring anomaly. With recent permissions, this hamlet will, when complete, have approximately 75 dwellings. It has a cafe/restaurant and shop with employment, its own electricity generation scheme that provides renewable energy to at least 70 of these dwellings and a major tourist/leisure facility with Springvale Fisheries. 66 of the dwellings are single storey structures of which the majority will be occupied by over 55 year old residents. This site at present already enjoys all of the home delivered services mentioned earlier. The reasoning why this village cannot accept further development is flawed.	The emphasis is to place development in the most suitable and sustainable locations. The figures for the number of dwellings in Bevercotes was taken from August 2018. At this time, the number of dwellings in Bevercotes parish was small. Lound Hall/ Springvale development is located within Bothamsall Parish. Some dwellings are also located in West Markham Parish.
DBLP170	M Malcolm	East Markham Parish Council	With regard to housing in East Markham, acknowledge the 10% cap is 52 houses and the 20% cap is 100 properties. Have 93 planning permissions granted and will only need to provide land for seven more properties. Concerned that the majority of houses granted are for large 4/5 bedrooomed properties on what are inappropriately small plots, which results in an appearance of overcrowding that is not in keeping with the village, this is very apparent on Beckland Hill. Request that the seven additional permissions will be for small starter homes or properties suitable for older residents to downsize to, on suitably sized plots. This is in line with our Neighbourhood Plan. The Council should take more cognisance of the Neighbourhood Plan with regard to parking on new sites. The plan indicates a number of parking spaces per property. It is not just that there should be sufficient parking spaces, but additional room for manoeuvring on the site is required, so that residents do not have to reverse on to the narrow main roads. The District Council would not approve parking for a Company in such circumstances.	The calculation for the 20% cap was based on the number of dwellings in East Markham parish in August 2018. Any residential development permitted since the 1st April 2018 will contribute towards meeting the 20% requirement.
DBLP173	J Cox	Lichfields on behalf of SP Scholey and the estate of WA Scholey	Policy 8 should be revised to remove the blanket housing requirement and arbitrary 20% growth cap for settlements in Rural Bassetlaw and criterion j) and k) in the policy should be removed for the same reason. Para 6.36 acknowledges that housing delivery and demand has, in recent, been greatest in rural parishes of Bassetlaw so arbitrarily limiting the growth of these areas would, significantly undermine the deliverability of the Plan's proposed housing supply. Reject the approach set out at para 8.16 that states for areas not developing a Neighbourhood Plan, will only seek to allocate sites in rural areas up to one hectare in size, unless the regeneration benefits of a larger site can be clearly demonstrated. Such an approach is flawed as it ignores the other important benefits that can be achieved as part of larger scale forms of development and which are supported by other policies (e.g. the delivery of affordable housing and community facilities - policies 3, 23 and 24). The approach set out in para 8.16 should not be taken forward.	The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	Support the strategic criteria for rural settlements, in particular, support criteria E – to retain where possible or mitigate for changes to natural boundaries.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP187	T Swales		The best people to decide where and how much development should take place is the community itself, and not an arbitrary 20% cap. Take Dunham and Ragnall. Dunham has seen a significant increase in the number of houses in living memory and suitable areas for development are now limited. Ragnall has seen a 25% reduction in houses in living memory. A 20% allocation will not even see Ragnall back to where it was in the 1970s. Let the people decide!	The community has the opportunity to plan for where the new development is located through the development of a Neighbourhood Plan.
DBLP191	K Miller	National Trust	Helpful in protecting the open character of the countryside and providing several additional criteria to protect the countryside, including: c) It would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside and farmland e) The site retains where possible or mitigates for changes to natural boundaries such as trees, hedgerows, embankments, water courses and drainage ditches	The open countryside is heavily protected throughout the policies in the Local Plan. There are also policies that encourage the redevelopment of brownfield sites and sites/land in larger settlements across the District.

DBLP194	H Leggett	Emery Planning on behalf of J G Pears Property Ltd	The support offered by the Plan for development at both High and Low Marnham is welcomed. Note how tightly the settlement boundaries are drawn and the 'cap' placed upon levels of residential development. The use of a 'cap' on the levels of development is discordant with the aims and objectives of the Framework which provides a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Each case for development should be considered on its own merits and with regard to other material considerations. It may be that some places will require additional growth over the Plan period for specific purposes, such as supporting local infrastructure. Placing a 'cap' on levels of development would prohibit potentially appropriate and necessary development and greater flexibility should be provided in this regard. Greater support should also be provided in this Section for the redevelopment of major previously developed sites in the countryside for a full range of potential uses. Para 8.23 highlights that the Council is keen to support sustainable patterns of economic growth and states that whilst there is no requirement to allocate land for employment, the policy supports sustainable economic development of an appropriate scale in rural areas. It goes on to state that in non-NP areas, growth is potentially possible, but will be character-driven. It is not clear from the Plan what is meant by 'appropriate scale' or in non-NP areas 'character-driven'. Language used in the Plan should be as objective as possible and offer greater clarity for users. As set out above, this section of the Plan should make clear that the redevelopment of major previously developed sites in the countryside will be permissible. Policy 8 (2) relating to Economic Growth allows for: "Proposals for economic developments within close proximity and easy access to the A1 corridor, or comprehensive redevelopment of a major brownfield site that will meet an unexpected demand, will be supported if it can be demonstrated to the council's satisfaction that it will deliver a high quality, exemplary scheme that will increase the overall number, quality and skills level of local jobs." In general this is welcomed concerned with several elements of the phraseology. To require 'comprehensive redevelopment' of a major brownfield site may not always be appropriate or achievable, particularly given the scale of some such sites. The term 'to the Council's satisfaction' is vague and offers no certainty to applicants as to what will be policy compliant. The requirement for development to be 'exemplary' is also disproportionate and superfluous given the policy already requires development to be 'high quality'. Finally, with regard to Policy 8 the requirements for new employment to "increase the overall number, quality and skills level of local jobs" is considered to be excessively restrictive and should instead be expressed in terms of 'or' rather than 'and'.	The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas. However, if a community wants to plan for further growth, then this is possible through the justification and development of a Neighbourhood Plan.
DBLP197	N Baseley	IBA Planning Ltd.	The Council's general approach is acceptable – would like to see a little more flexibility built in to ensure the housing cap does not unduly/arbitrarily rule out a perfectly acceptable and sustainable windfall site in the centre of a village in circumstances whereby the settlement has been allowed to grow up to the cap via peripheral sites that have been developed on land that necessarily formerly comprised part of the open countryside. Understand the need for a general cap, but there will no doubt be circumstances arising during the Plan period whereby the application of a strict cap will present an illogical restriction on a perfectly acceptable windfall site in the centre of a village unless the policy is worded to incorporate the necessary flexibility.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP198	S Trough	Pegasus Planning on behalf of Sunnyside Dairy Farms Limited	Supportive of the overall strategy, which for Rural Bassetlaw, seeks to support proportional growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development to support the living, working and environmentally diverse landscape of the district. The Council is proposing a positive approach to development in rural communities and clearly distinguishes between settlements where growth is (Figure 7) and is not (Figure 8) supported; based on settlement size and potential impact of development, as well as the ability to enhance and maintain the viability of rural communities by supporting local services. Normanton on Trent is a settlement where growth is supported. This approach is supported and is in accordance with paragraph 78 of the 2019 NPPF, which seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas by locating housing where it will enhance and maintain the vitality of rural communities. Paragraph 78 continues that planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Table 7 of the Draft Local Plan sets out the residual requirement and capped growth number for each settlement, and for Normanton on Trent confirms that there is a housing requirement of 24 dwellings, capped growth of 41 dwellings, a residual requirement of 24 dwellings and 12 planning permissions at 1st April 2018. As with Policy 2 which sets out the overall housing requirement for the District, the housing requirement for each settlement at Table 7 should be expressed as a minimum. Land north of Gracefield Lane provides an opportunity to meet housing requirements in Normanton on Trent.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP200	S Williams	Savills on behalf of landowners of Top Farm, Elkesley	Support the approach to "the rurals" in respect of finding the residual requirement beyond the garden villages of 438 dwellings through deliverable, developable sites in Neighbourhood Plan areas. The Council have recognised that the OAN figure set out by DCLG is a baseline figure and through incorporating the results of the EDNA it has been emphasised that an uplift from the standardised OAN was needed. Growth in the village of Elkesley ranges from between 36-66 new homes over the plan period (Table 7) and as such new sites are required to be brought forward following the undevelopable nature of the 33 units identified in the current adopted Neighbourhood Plan (related to refused application 18/11/00004). Subject to a masterplanning exercise the sites offer the ability to directly meet this need through accommodating the new homes across both or one parcel. It is important that rural settlements such as Elkesley are allowed to manage growth in positive way through allocating deliverable sites to meet the needs and help sustain the critical mass and ensure facilities and services continue to thrive and younger generations are able to afford new homes, to this end additional allocations within Elkesley are supported in order to meet this need on deliverable sites. In accordance with paragraph 77 and 78 and PPG Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20160519.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP203	N Pleasant	NIL Consulting on behalf of Caddick Land	Supports the overall objectives in the Plan, particularly Policy 8 and Policy 9 where they encourage economic growth and development which responds to market demand. The forthcoming Site Allocations consultation should go a step further and specifically allocate the site for logistics, manufacturing and ancillary uses. Such an approach would build on the Bassetlaw Economic Development Needs Assessment which specifically identifies this area for demand led major, long term, market facing, logistics and manufacturing uses. The Local Plan must respond to clear market signals and allocate the site.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP205	H Godley	Fisher German on behalf of P Hinds	The policy states that the delivery of 1,777 new dwellings will be supported in the rural settlements of Bassetlaw. Note that the policy states that this requirement is a minimum. This is supported. Support the housing requirement for Rural Bassetlaw will be delivered through existing permissions and sites allocated through the Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan site allocation process. In areas without site allocations (including made Neighbourhood Plan areas), have concerns that the criteria in Policy 8 as currently proposed are too restrictive on the size of non-allocated sites that can come forward. The Council should be proactive now and allocate sites to meet village housing requirements. This will assist delivery of the Council's housing requirement and assist in contributing to a robust five year housing land supply.	The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.
DBLP207	M. Braithwaite	Robert Doughty Consultancy on behalf of J. Travis	We note the approach, outlined in paragraph 8.16 and Policy 8, that the Local Plan will only seek to allocate sites in those areas that do not benefit from a Neighbourhood Plan. This is a reasonable approach that will help support those communities engaged in Neighbourhood Planning and reduce any conflict between the two types of plan. We are concerned that in those circumstances where the Local Plan does make allocations in "Rural Bassetlaw" it will only allocate sites to meet the minimum growth target for the settlement. We do not consider this approach to be justified. The most appropriate allocations in a specific settlement may exceed this growth target. Rigid adherence to this target may result in the allocation of the most sustainable sites.	The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas.
DBLP210	C. Challenger	Lound Parish Council	Broad support for the context of the plan, but have concerns in relation to the 20% cap being detailed in respect of the housing requirement allocation. We question the need for having a target housing requirement (a) followed by a further capped growth figure (b) and view that this additional number (b) could be potentially seen as a means for exploitation by housing developers to force additional housing into areas not necessarily equipped for such a substantial additional growth. We would like to suggest that, instead of the proposed fixed percentage 20% Cap, each Neighbourhood should, using the BDC Requirement as a target, be given the flexibility to plan for a higher level of development that is appropriate for its area and infrastructure, based on a location referendum included within each neighbourhood plan.	The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas. Each of the identified rural settlements will have a requirement of 20% growth.
DBLP218	E Ridley	Pegasus Planning on behalf of E Fisher and Company Limited	Not considered that the housing numbers adequately reflect the future growth prospects of Bassetlaw and its long-term economic competitiveness of the District. The proposed objectively assessed need should be in the higher region of the identified range of 308- 608 dwelling per annum. As such, the identified need for housing in Rural Bassetlaw would need to increase respectively. There will be greater scope to allocate an identified growth target for individual sustainable villages within the District, including Langold. Comment on the restrictions facing those development sites that are unallocated in the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan. Imposing a cap on the level of growth in a rural village is highly restrictive. Policy 8 is amended as follows: In areas without site allocations which address the housing requirement, in the defined rural settlements will generally be supported where it does not harm the surrounding open character of the countryside and contributes the sustainability of that settlement alongside satisfying or satisfies the following strategic criteria: b) It would not result in unacceptable coalescence with any neighbouring settlement; and c) It would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside and farmland; and d) The proposal is of a scale and in a location that respects the pattern of development of the settlement that is in keeping with the core shape and form** of the settlement and will not adversely harm its character and appearance; and f) The site conserves sustains and enhances local heritage and environmental characteristics; The approach of capping development as part of a Local Plan strategy is something that has been tested by the Planning Inspectorate at Examination. The NPPF states that "to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed." The Inspector at East Riding of Yorkshire Council, stated proposed caps would do the opposite and instead "deliberately suppress the level of housing that would otherwise be delivered through the consistent application of the broad approach to housing distribution chosen by the Council." The imposition of a 'cap' to development is highly restrict and contrary to the objectives of national policy. Policy 8 does not meet the requirement of the tests of soundness because it is not consistent with national policy and is not justified in its approach.	The spatial strategy has now been revised. The level of growth within the rural area is now 1500 requirement for the identified Large Rural Settlements and 667 for the identified Small Rural Settlements. The majority of this growth is being planned through the development of Neighbourhood Plans across the rural areas. Each of the identified rural settlements will have a requirement of 20% growth.
DBLP221	B Weedall	Gladman Developments	The policy sets out a list of criteria which must be met for development to come forward in areas without site allocations to address the housing requirement in the defined rural settlements. Largely supportive over the criteria raise concerns with the following: "j) It does not, through a single housing proposal, increase the numbers of dwellings in the settlement by 5% or more. k) It does not, through a housing proposal, cumulatively increase the number of dwellings in the settlement by 20% or more when in combination with other development built or committed in the settlement." The approaches listed above are considered to be onerous and would set a development cap on settlements across Rural Bassetlaw without any consideration of the sustainability merits of a development proposal. Should the proposed growth levels be reached in individual settlements, Policy 8 would effectively act to arbitrarily preclude the delivery of sustainable development proposals from coming forward. This would be contrary to the explicit requirements of the NPPF which makes clear that sustainable development should go ahead without delay in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The housing requirement in Policy 1 seeks to meet a 'minimum' housing requirement and this should be reflected in the policy wording for lower order settlements. Recommend that criteria J and K are deleted as they are not considered to be positively prepared.	Policy 8 has now been revised (Policy ST2) in the Local Plan. This policy requirement has also been amended to add further protection and guidance for potential developers and for the creation and revision of Neighbourhood Plans.
DBLP228	Dr J Hillman		Bevercotes is listed as a settlement where growth is not supported. The Draft Plan is therefore contradictory. Bevercotes is in fact a rural, isolated area, and is best suited to reversion or re-wilding. Bevercotes is better suited to habitat gain and biodiversity offsetting funded through S106 agreements from other development around Bassetlaw.	Bevercotes Parish is considered too small to accommodate future development. Noted regarding the suitability for habitat creation and biodiversity gain

DBLP229	S Ashton		It is proposed to deliver at least 1,777 (27%) new homes in the rural villages and Hayton is suitable to accommodate proportionate new development through the plan period.	Yes, Hayton will support up to a 20% increase in residential dwellings over the plan period.
DBLP230	D Argent-Cook		Am a resident of Gamston which is in close proximity to the suggested Garden Village on the site of the current Gamston Airport. Gamston is a pleasant village of 87 dwellings with a population at the 2011 Census was 246. It is designated a conservation village with no identified development planned or expansion beyond the current village boundaries. The local has a year group pan of 14 and the current pupil count is 102. There are no other services in the village and there is a limited bus service to and from Retford and Newark. The plan suggests a proposed increase of 20% inline with all other areas of the district. This increase would amount to an increase of 49 residents, it is predicted that this could be achieved by identified sites within the curtilage of the present village as well as bringing back into use empty properties and redundant farm buildings.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP231	P Willcock	Clarborough & Welham Parish Council	Extremely concerned that the current, and any future, Neighbourhood Plan (NP) will retain its relevance for only 2 years after a Referendum! (para 14 of the 'NPPF'). The implication from this is an almost constant need to refresh a NP. Neighbourhood Plans are developed by volunteers - in this Parish 8 out of the 10 members of the Steering Group were retired. It is unreasonable to expect these volunteers to be, effectively, almost full-time unpaid workers. The 2011 legislation indicates that they are relevant for 15 years. This timescale allows the Parishes or Forums which work on the original Plan to have time to follow-up and implement the Plan. The new 2 year proposal will allow no 'down time' from the stress of creating the Plan nor any time to implement the Policies of the Plan. This proposal will 'kill' the Neighbourhood Plan movement! The ethos of NPs is the development of the Plan by local residents, a taking back of local control for local development. There needs to be the establishment of a local resource base for advice and data collection beyond that which is currently available to NP Steering (planning) groups. Current provision in Bassetlaw is good on advice but the new need for constant refreshment requires a more practical input of resources to take on some of the practical tasks which a NP requires. This could be a 'Project Manager' working with and for a number of different NP groups perhaps 1 day per week for each group. This would be in addition to those professional planning consultants employed via 'Locality' grants etc, employed for specific tasks eg writing a character assessment.	The Clarborough and Welham Neighbourhood Plan is a currently made plan and is still the most up to date policy document for the community. The emerging local plan has set a requirement for additional growth (from 1st April 2018) at 20% increase. This would be a good time for the Neighbourhood Plan to be reviewed, alongside the Local Plan, to plan for this growth.
DBLP231	P Willcock	Clarborough & Welham Parish Council	Broadly accepts the suggestion of the 10% requirement of housing land site allocation. Can see no disadvantages in this for either our own Parish. This is especially the case in view of the details on this provided in Policy 8. Reservations concerning both the site allocation and/or 'windfall' cap to 93 houses in the Parish in order to achieve the 20% 'cap'. Taking into account the single site allocation of 38 houses in the NP and the existing 3 sites which have Planning Consent, there are a remaining 52 houses requiring sites according to the Plan. Policy 8 allows sites no larger than 5% of the current housing stock ie 25 in our Parish. What is the basis of this 5% figure? Surely the size of this maximum should be left to the individual Neighbourhood Plan to determine and not be pre-determined by either a developer or the District Council. Some Parishes may have sites suitable for this size of development but others will not, or may not wish to have sites this large. The essence of a Neighbourhood Plan is in the wishes of residents. An allowance of 5% of existing housing stock on a single site may be far too large for the character of some Parishes including Clarborough & Welham. Concerns over the infrastructure pressures which development to 20% will place on two villages. The Primary School has only recently been extended to accommodate all those pupils who wish to attend it, the village shop copes with present population, the Post Office is only part-time and the bus service is barely adequate. The A620, which takes all traffic to Retford is very busy as are the peripheral roads on the north side of Retford. This will only get worse with existing Planning Consents or proposed planning applications for housing on the north side of Retford. The 20% 'cap' should be reduced to 15%. Even this does not allow for the existing diversity amongst the rural parishes. But it would give Parishes a greater chance to preserve their rural nature, a feature of Bassetlaw, and much valued by residents and visitors. Excessive growth in these communities will spoil the variety of the landscape evident within the village structure across the 103 villages of the District. This is the character of the area. A variety of older villages which have retained the very nature of their origins and other villages with sympathetic developments. This character should be preserved. The 5% maximum size per single development should be reconsidered at, perhaps, 2%. This would allow Parishes to manage development through their NP to produce more cohesive, integrated, less dominant and intrusive developments. Alternatively, suggest that where there is no NP in place or the NP is no longer taken to determine planning applications, the Parish Council should have a formal role, not just the comment role it currently has, into the overall control of the planning process for any development of more than 5 houses that falls within the 10% to 20% range of additional housing. Want to ensure all housing development and business development is consistent with the vision and policies set out in the Clarborough & Welham Neighbourhood Plan. Want to ensure all development retains the character of our Parish and the two separate villages. It is not convinced that some of the proposals of the 'Draft' Strategic Plan allows this to take place in a way which is beneficial to our Parish.	Policy 8 has now been revised (Policy ST2) in the Local Plan. This policy requirement has also been amended to add further protection and guidance for potential developers and for the creation and revision of Neighbourhood Plans.
DBLP251	Mr & Mrs Wagstaff		Support the proposals for housing in the rural villages.	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP261	A Argent-Cook	On behalf of All Saints Parochial Church Council, Eaton and Gamston	Eaton and Gamston are pleasant villages of 28 and 87 dwellings respectively with a population at the 2011 Census of 103 and 246 respectively. Gamston is designated a conservation village and both villages have no identified development planned or expansion beyond the current village boundaries. The local Church of England (VA) Primary with a year group pan of 14 and the current pupil count is 102. There are no other services in either village other than All Saints Church in Eaton. St. Peters Church in Gamston closed in 2014, the post office and shop closed in the 1980's and there is a very limited bus service to and from Retford and Newark. The draft plan suggests that the local population will be subject to a proposed increase of 20% inline with all other areas of the district. This increase would amount to an increase of 69 residents, it is predicted that this could be achieved by identified sites within the curtilage of the present village as well as bringing back into use empty properties and redundant farm buildings.	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP262	S Patience	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Policy 8 requires development within the rural areas to demonstrate that suitable infrastructure provision is available. Reference is made to surface water and foul drainage but not water supply and sewage treatment consistent with Policy 16 of the Local Plan. Criterion (h) of Policy 8 should refer to water supply as well as foul drainage and sewage treatment. h) It can be served by sustainable infrastructure provision such as water supply, surface water, waste water drainage, sewage treatment and highways; and... Ask that the Local Plan makes it clear that new and improved infrastructure provided by Anglian Water which supports development outside of the existing settlements is supported in principle.	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP281	B Lange	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome Policy 8 as it offers protection against speculative, out of scale and unsympathetic development, and recognizes the value of open countryside and settlement form.	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP283	C Hollands	Clayworth Parish Council	The Housing requirement figure for Clayworth Village of 14 in the period to 2035 is considered to be a maximum figure and one at which growth should be capped. The Parish Council has a preference for 'Brownfield' sites to be developed. The Parish Council is opposed to development on 'Greenfield' sites due to the Conservation nature of the Village. Any development that does take place should take into account the Character of the Village, the existing buildings and also the amenities that are available.	The proposed 20% growth requirement is capped at 20%
DBLP286	K Dyer	Kenneth Dyer Associates	One issue that is important to all Conservation Areas and not just the village of Clayworth where I live. The application of a percentage increase in dwelling numbers across the area and the fact that this is applied to a location or village Conservation Area, when the particular location etc., does not have a Local Plan in place. As somebody who has worked hard to achieve 'some' development in the Conservation Areas, of the right sort and of appropriate design am concerned at 'throwing down' on a percentage in any Conservation Area, without a huge effort by everybody to make this work and not just wreck the very thing that has been protected for many years now. Many conservation areas, by their very nature are an asset to the area and not just for the residents of that location. They help give good feeling to a general area and help promote tourists or visitors. But every development, small or large, should be considered carefully on its merits, both locally and generally for the area. When a major location is being thought through and the requirements are being satisfied with schools, medical centres and transport considerations is it going to make a difference if this has 1000 houses or 1100 houses? This extra 100 houses would save the spread across a number of Conservation Area locations. Keeping and protecting the work carried out by many of your colleagues 'on our behalf' over a number of years.	Impact on heritage is an important issue and policies in the Local Plan deal with this from a strategic and development management point. However, the detail of any scheme will be determined through the planning application process where there is more detail to assess potential impacts on heritage assets.
DBLP298	975897		No support for any policy. Building more houses increases climate change and destroys vital countryside. The Plan will do the opposite of what you propose. The Council needs to concentrate on deprived areas, likes Worksop and Harworth rather than build out of area. Rural locations need protection, not building on.	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Note 4km is an "only just" for Scrooby	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Then why have a neighbourhood plan if Bassetlaw District Council is going to tell us where to build ! The last sentence says "The Council may also allocate sites in areas without neighbourhood plans or where neighbourhood plans do not intend to allocate sites, as and where appropriate", this is wrong...	The revised Local Plan is not intending to allocate any sites within the rural areas except from Tuxford. Although this is just to help inform the review of their Neighbourhood Plan.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		But if a developer is only doing small sites of 1 or 2 homes they will not have the resources or profitability to provide these infrastructure enhancements and so they will not build. There must be some sort of collaboration / grouping together for these enhancements.	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Cross reference to the SNAP Plan. In Figure 8, Scrooby is defined as a Rural Settlement where growth is supported, subject to compliance to the Policy	Thank you for your comments.
DBLP384	988726		Support for rural housing which has been restricted in previous years	Thank you for your comments.

DBLP400	98956	Nottinghamshire County Council - Highways	1.) and k) There is a risk that these sub-policies will result in a number of adjacent small developments with separate access arrangements when a larger well connected development could be more sustainable and safer in overall highway safety terms.	Thank you for your comments.
Policy 9: Workop				
DBLP2	Miss S Gaskell		Would like better shops what cater for larger size folk. Don't want no takeaways. What the town centre needs is a Primark something to draw people in, it also wants a bit of a facelift, some of the shops are outdated, looking a bit tatty. If you are proposing to build new homes then the town centre has got to grow too. It cannot remain as it is. If the town centre stays the way it is then all it will do is drive more people to Meadowhall or Crystal Peaks. Its alright building new homes for families but then you want them to come into our town centre and spend money, which they don't do. Workop needs to be put back on the map. We want Workop to be not just a nice place to live, but a great place to shop.	The Bassetlaw Retail and Leisure Study states that there is no need for additional floorspace in Workop Town Centre. The Council works with property owners and through other schemes to enhance the town centre environment.
DBLP125	C and T Tory		Live on Mansfield Road close to Lady Lea Lane where there was planning put forward to build 275 houses and make a road by the side of our houses onto a new estate. The planning was refused. Still object to this site being used for housing partly because of the impact on the road. Mansfield Road is a busy road, the traffic is constant and queues along the road past our houses. The roundabout onto the A57 bypass and going into town, which had major works on it a couple of years ago, has made the roundabout safer but has not eased the congestion. It is dangerous to get in and out of our drive and the constant traffic noise is horrendous. This would be all around if a new road down the side of our house went onto a new estate. With 275 new houses, multiplied by 3 for the amount of vehicles each day, 825 vehicles more on Mansfield Road with the noise and pollution that go with it. Mansfield Road would be a bottleneck and would make St Annes estate a rat run for people avoiding the queues, making roads on that estate unsafe. The road coming from that estate onto Mansfield Road is difficult to get in and out and can be dangerous. One of the main reasons for the planning being refused was the Manor Lodge and farm on Lady Lea Lane which is Grade 1 listed. Lady Lea Lane is a lovely country lane used by local residents for walking, dog walking, running, horse riding as it is a bridleway. This is a beautiful setting for the Manor Lodge. Not spoil the setting of historical assets by putting houses close to them but in keeping they are considered. There have also been many comments put forward before about the flood risk closer to the river and at the edge of St. Annes estate.	A housing land availability assessment is being undertaken for the next stage of the Local Plan. The site has been submitted for consideration as a housing site in the Land Availability Assessment which will inform site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP136	Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	The housing requirement across the borough should be increased and that growth should be directed towards the main settlements, including Workop. The level of development for Workop is 1,600 homes (24% of the overall housing requirement) which is less than the rural area. There is extent permission for some 1,534 dwellings at April 2018 which, even taking into account a lapse rate, would leave only 284 dwellings to be allocated for the remainder of the plan period (17dpa). Given that the extant permissions will need to commence development within the 3 – 5 years of the plan period (depending on whether full or outline permission has been sought) the allocation will lead to the undue restriction of development towards the end of the plan period and leaves no reasonable flexibility in the supply of housing land through the plan period to respond to change. Workop is expected to deliver 33% of employment land in the District and that the town has successfully attracted a variety of employers in recent years, including manufacturing and distribution companies. It will be vital that the above economic growth is supported by sufficient housing growth. The policy will not support that growth. The housing requirement for Workop comprises a circa 9% increase in the number of homes within the District's largest settlement. That increase is below the proportionate level of growth that the Local Plan directs towards rural settlements notwithstanding the major role that Workop is intended to have in meeting the district's economic needs.	Whilst the residual housing requirement for Workop is low, it is a minimum figure. The Local Plan is seeking to allocate a large urban extension to the north of Workop (approximately 750 new homes). There are also a number of smaller, mostly brownfield sites within the town. The current supply of housing in Workop will also deliver a significant amount of housing to ensure a step change in economic growth in the town and the district.
DBLP149	H Godley	Fisher German on behalf of D Thorlby	States that the Council will support the delivery of sustainable development to meet the needs of Workop over the plan period. Where applicable, a number of criteria (a. to g.) must be satisfied by developments. Consider these to be typical of development policies across the country, as well as being consistent with national policy. Note that the policy states that the requirement for 1,600 dwellings in Workop is a minimum and that this will be delivered through existing planning permissions and new site allocations. This is supported. Land at Gateford Toll Bar is an available and deliverable site which is suitable for allocation in the emerging Plan. Policy 9 also states that the Council will support new housing on non-allocated sites within the development boundary of Workop. Support this, consider that the plan should also contain policies that ensure flexibility should the housing requirement not be met and which facilitate development on unallocated sites adjoining the development boundary, subject to meeting a number of criteria. This would enable the Council to refuse inappropriate development, whilst meeting its housing needs should any of the allocations not deliver.	Support for the approach to Workop is noted. A housing land availability assessment is being undertaken. This site will be considered as a housing site - the outcome will inform site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Further consideration will be given to the assessment of non allocated sites adjacent to settlement boundaries.
DBLP172	J Buckwell	dha planning on behalf of Laing O'Rourke	Welcome the recognition that 45ha of the district's employment land requirement will need to be delivered "in and around Workop from 2018 to 2035" (our emphasis). This should include a formal allocation at EIP.	Support for 45ha of employment land in Workop is noted. An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken to inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP171	V Chase	Indigo Planning on behalf of Columbia Threadneedle Property Investment	Represents the owners and managers of The Priory Shopping Centre, located in Workop Town Centre. It comprises 40 units and a large car park. The Priory provides a primary retail role in the town centre, with a range of tenants, in a highly accessible location by car and sustainable transport including cycling, walking, bus (0.4 miles from Workop Bus Station) and train (0.5m from Workop Train Station). Currently preparing an application for the partial redevelopment to upgrade the retail provision, servicing and access. Welcome the protection and enhancement of the Town Centre, and support its development and rationalisation to ensure its future resilience as a retail destination. Chapter 9 acknowledges that Workop is Bassetlaw's largest town (para 9.5). The centre has recently experienced an increase in vacant units, which is negatively affecting the vitality and viability of the town centre. A number of shop units have become vacant due to broader trends in the retail industry and a number of retailers have recently gone into administration. The closure of the M&S Foodstore shows that the town centre is under threat. It is key that town centre uses, including retail, are encouraged into Workop Town Centre above other, out of centre, locations. Para 9.1 seeks to revitalise the town centre through "reorganising the centre to create distinct retail and leisure zones". Policy 9 acknowledges that in terms of retail hierarchy, Workop is the largest Town Centre and will support town centre developments which maintain and enhance its vitality and viability. The town centre contains a mix of retailers. A common factor across the Town Centre retail units is that they are of below average size. Welcome requirement of an impact assessment for new out of centre retail units, of a lower floorspace threshold (929sqm) than in the NPPF. This will require a greater number of proposals to demonstrate that they will not have a significant negative impact on town centre retail. Welcome requirement for a sequential assessment to be undertaken for town centre uses proposed out of the town centre. Although the importance of the town centre's vitality and viability is acknowledged, consider additional wording should be included to ensure that main town centre uses, including retail uses, are provided within the town centre first, in accordance with the NPPF: "A sequential test will be required for edge of centre or out of centre main town centre proposals, as defined and identified by the NPPF". "Retail uses should be provided first within Workop town centre, Bassetlaw Council's largest town, including "The Priory Shopping Centre, in accordance with the NPPF".	Support for Policy 9, particularly the approach taken to the impact assessment and sequential test is welcome. It is not considered appropriate to add the text suggested as this may adversely affect the ability of other town centres in the District to secure retail uses. However, it is expected that the next version of the Local Plan will provide more context about the future of Workop town centre, including opportunities for change.
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	Support the inclusion of increasing climate change resilience through good quality design and protecting, conserving or enhancing Green Infrastructure in developments in Workop.	Support for Policy 9 a and g are welcome.
DBLP203	N Pleasant	NJL Consulting on behalf of Caddick Land	Supports the overall objectives in the Plan, particularly Policy 8 and Policy 9 where they encourage economic growth and development which responds to market demand. The forthcoming Site Allocations consultation should go a step further and specifically allocate the site for logistics, manufacturing and ancillary uses. Such an approach would build on the Bassetlaw Economic Development Needs Assessment which specifically identifies this area for demand led major, long term, market facing, logistics and manufacturing uses. The Local Plan must respond to clear market signals and allocate the site.	An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will include this site. This will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP217	S Hayle	Axis ped on behalf of FCC Environment	States that the Council support the delivery of sustainable development to meet the needs of Workop over the plan period. With regards to economic development, the policy confirms that at least 33% (45 hectares) of the District's employment land needs will be delivered in Workop. It goes on to confirm economic development proposals will be supported in appropriate locations in the existing settlement boundary. Support the inclusion of the subsequent paragraph which sets out that proposals for economic development in close proximity to Workop, that will meet an unexpected demand, will be supported if it can be demonstrated that it will deliver a high quality, exemplary scheme that will increase the overall number, quality and skills level of jobs. FCC's site which is located in close proximity to the settlement boundary will clearly deliver these aspirations. This is in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 80 which confirms that planning policies should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. It goes on to confirm that the approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future.	An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will include this site. This will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP221	B Weedall	Gladman Developments	Supportive of the approach contained in each of these areas which seeks to ensure sustainable development to meet needs. Note that housing development not identified in the Local Plan will only be supported if it is located in the development boundary. Caution with this approach and do not consider the use of built up area boundaries to be appropriate as this would effectively provide a blanket restriction policy for development lying outside of the built-up area and within 'the open countryside' without assessing the sustainability credentials of a development proposal. It is recommended that a flexible stance is taken so development proposals not identified in the Local Plan are able to come forward. Recommend incorporating a criteria based policy to achieve this linked in Policy 1 and the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Such an approach would allow the Plan to protect itself against unsustainable development at the same time as being flexible to additional development opportunities to come forward to meet identified needs. Refers to the submission version of the Harborough Local Plan, Policy GD2 which states: "In addition to sites allocated by this Local Plan and neighbourhood plans, development within or contiguous with the existing or committed built up area of Market Harborough, Key Centres, the Leicestershire Principle Urban Area, Rural Centres and Selected Rural Villages will be permitted where..."	Further consideration will be given to the assessment of non allocated sites adjacent to settlement boundaries.
DBLP251	Mr & Mrs Waegstaff		Support the proposals for housing in Workop	Support for Policy 9 welcome.
DBLP356	988409		The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Workop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. Indeed, the plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure.	Policies 9 and 10 contain the same type of information. Both identify the housing requirement f and the number of new dwellings expected to be provided over the plan period.

DBLP443	990800		States that the Council support the delivery of sustainable development to meet the needs of Worksop over the plan period. Policy confirms that at least 33% (45 hectares) of the District's employment land needs will be delivered in Worksop. It confirms economic development proposals will be supported in appropriate locations within the existing settlement boundary. Support the inclusion of the subsequent paragraph which sets out that proposals for economic development in close proximity to Worksop, that will meet an unexpected demand, will be supported if it can be demonstrated that it will deliver a high quality, exemplary scheme that will increase the overall number, quality and skills level of jobs. FCC's site is located in close proximity to the settlement boundary will clearly deliver these aspirations. This is in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 80 which confirms that planning policies should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. It confirms that the approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future. Additional employment floorspace at Carlton Forest is able to respond to market demand and contribute to rural sustainable economic growth.	An employment land availability assessment is being undertaken and will include this site. This will inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
Policy 10: Retford				
DBLP3	Mr P Crawley		Strongly feel that the existing boundaries to Retford and Ordsall should be maintained with no further expansion given the recent concentration of new housing and the load on infrastructure, schools, roads and access to the town centre. Oppose the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tilt Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets being developed for housing.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. Another area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land.
DBLP4	Mrs E Crawley		Strongly feel that the existing boundaries to Retford and Ordsall should be maintained with no further expansion given the recent concentration of new housing and the load on infrastructure, schools, roads and access to the town centre. Oppose the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tilt Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets being developed for housing.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. Another area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land.
DBLP5	Mr B Crawley		Strongly feel that the existing boundaries to Retford and Ordsall should be maintained with no further expansion given the recent concentration of new housing and the load on infrastructure, schools, roads and access to the town centre. Oppose the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tilt Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets being developed for housing.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. Another area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land.
DBLP6	Mr & Mrs C Fletcher		Propose that when future site allocation proposals come forward for Retford the Bassetlaw Plan should include planning policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tilt Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. Another area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land.
DBLP7	Mr D Bee		The plans to build houses off Tilt Lane will feed numerous cars etc. onto the horrifically congested Tilt Lane. The diversion of heavy lorries past the school on Tilt Lane was a terrible decision. To get caught up with two Tomlinson's six axle 50 tonners is quite intimidating. There is a terrible accident waiting to happen outside the school, these giants cannot stop should a child dash into the road. What is needed if you decide to authorise any houses, is a new road from the far end of Tilt Lane across to Welham Road bridging the canal if necessary. Not a single house should be built until the problem has been solved.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required.
DBLP8	J Kerley		There are areas on the outskirts of Retford, specifically on agricultural land i.e. Ordall, Bracken Lane, Tilt Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets that should be in the Bassetlaw Plan that should include planning policies that explicitly state that in fact there will be NO expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Otherwise it would be creating a sprawling town out of control! This would be extremely detrimental to Retford with huge traffic problems and an overloading of existing services i.e. schools and doctors to name but two!	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. Another area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land.
DBLP9	Mr & Mrs T Noble		Propose that when future site allocation proposals come forward for Retford the Bassetlaw Plan should include planning policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tilt Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land.
DBLP10	Mr & Mrs P West		Propose that when future site allocation proposals come forward for Retford the Bassetlaw Plan should include planning policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tilt Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land.
DBLP11	Mr & Mrs S Wilson		Concerned that some current planning applications in the Retford area are on land outside of the current boundaries of the town and an urban sprawl without key infrastructure being put in place would be highly undesirable. Live close to the agricultural land adjoining Bigsby Road and adjoining roads and object strongly to such land being used for housing when it is not in fact needed by the Council to fulfil its housing quotas.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. Another area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. Policy 10 states that 853 new homes are required over the plan period to meet the housing requirement for Retford. This helps meet the overall housing figure established by Government.

DBLP12	Mr & Mrs BF Haines		Re: the proposal to build houses at the bottom of Bigsby Road. A lot of problems would be made with the extra traffic on Tiln Lane and the main road into town. This should be given consideration.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required.
DBLP14	E Ashforth		Recently attended a meeting by our MP John Mann where he outlined the details of future housing in Retford. He drew our attention to the future planning policy which explicitly states that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town, and he said that specific reference should be made to the agricultural land around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and the neighbouring streets. With that in mind, I thoroughly agree with the Draft Plan.	Housing land availability is currently being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next Local Plan.
DBLP15	Mrs A Godley		Hope that proposed plans from developers to build 171 dwellings on land adjoining Tiln Lane and Bigsby Road does not go ahead. There are many reasons but the most important one is that there is only one access to this town. This will be for all the 178 occupants of the new estate (Badgers Chase - already passed) and the 171 on Tiln Lane. All these people will have two cars each - most going past the school along with heavy lorries avoiding the low bridge at Claborough. They must be made to see that this is madness with only one narrow access to the town. Come and see the congestion we have already when the school turns out at 3.30. Developers should be looking at the land on which stands the soon to be demolished Cottam Power Station.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. The Assessment will only consider sites that have been submitted by landowners/promoters.
DBLP17	Mr R Phillips		Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required.	Housing land availability is currently being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP18	C Redford		The need for economic development in this area is crucial for the growth of Retford with the closure of two Power stations in the near future, and the job losses at the airport. Know of businesses currently located on the airfield that have worked very hard and invested heavily to build a secure future for their company and employees from the local area. If Gamston Airport is to close and with its prime position of the A1 surely it could be better used for business expansion rather than housing development which would help fulfil the EDNA requirements.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP20	P Launders		Propose that when future site allocations come forward for Retford, the Plan should include planning policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP21	Mr & Mrs B Hopps		Propose that when future site allocations come forward for Retford, the Plan should include planning policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP27	Mrs R Owen		Propose that when future site allocations come forward for Retford, the Plan should include planning policies that say there will be NO expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP28	Mr S Owen		Propose that when future site allocations come forward for Retford, the Plan should include planning policies that say there will be NO expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tiln Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP33	P Holmes		In principle the proposal of the 2 garden villages is a brilliant idea and has my support BUT the Retford boundary NOT be extended either prior to or after the garden villages have been built, i.e. no development on the fields between Ordsall and Eaton/Morton. Must discount using Jockey House Lane for vehicle access to and from the Gamston garden village as yet again Ordsall will be hit with the rising number of vehicles using the road to get into Retford. Will object to any development that increases traffic flow on to Jockey House Lane and High Street at Ordsall.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers including the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP33	P Holmes		Was told that building isn't likely to commence on the Gamston garden village until approximately 2025 and that the required amount of housing up until 2025 would be on land earmarked for building in the Land Availability Assessment. There is substantial land earmarked on the edge of Ordsall (LAA276, LAA270, LA141, LAA246, LAA247 & LAA067). Ordsall: High Street: Vehicles park at all times making this a single lane over most of the length making it difficult driving conditions. This is a busy road and not suitable for increased volumes of traffic. This is confirmed when a chemist shop on High Street was refused in 2014 due to concerns about increased traffic levels. Goosemoor Bridge: Links Ordsall to Goosemoor Lane & on to London Road is inadequate for today's traffic, the current volume of cars and buses & heavy commercial vehicles. The new pedestrian footbridge is a big improvement. Ollerton Road/Welbeck Road: The area around the Post Office/Co-op is congested every day with limited off-road parking. Further housing in or around Ordsall will make this worse. There are numerous children using this area to and from school and using local facilities. West Hill Road: During school drop off times West Hill Road is reduced to single line traffic due to parked cars for Ordsall Infant & Junior School. This is a difficult road to negotiate at these times of day and will be acute should traffic volumes increase. River Idle: The fields at the bottom of Bankside frequently flood. High Street regularly floods with persistent rain as the drains cannot cope. The main sewer runs down High Street and even with several housing developments, no changes to the main sewer have been undertaken. More houses will lead to more flooding on High Street and into Retford and the villages in the Idle Valley. The more fields that are built on, the more drainage problems we will have.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. An area of consideration will be the potential flood risk.

DBLP35	M Barden	Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	The Plan did not appear to address the impact on Retford i.e. clearly more people could/should be better for the businesses of the town. All of which would be welcomed but have concerns about the level of infrastructure in place. There are already traffic delays in and out of Retford which would be exasperated by two developments of this size. There are insufficient spaces for existing residents served by the businesses of Retford, let alone any additional numbers created by two developments of this size.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required.
DBLP51	S Tucker	Canal & River Trust	Welcome reference to the canal in part 3 with regards to enhancing Chesterfield Canal's visual and functional relationship to the town centre. An improved relationship between our network and the town centres would help these communities benefit from the presence of the canal including access to the wellbeing benefits our network can bring. The policy do not fully explain how the functional relationship of our waterways to the town centres can be achieved. This could significantly harm the deliverability of the policy aim, as the policy does not make it clear how the enhancement of the relationship between our canal and the town centres should be achieved. There is a need for the Local Plan to provide a more precise guide to how development should address the waterways in Worksop and Retford. Without this will be unable to determine how best to guide development next to Chesterfield Canal would best achieve the overall aims of part 3. An effective policy could be achieved if additional supporting text is included to explore how development within these towns should address waterside spaces. Measures include: - ensuring development along the canal integrates with the waterway; - ensuring development is designed to improve access to, along and from the waterway; - ensuring development optimises natural surveillance of the waterway; - ensuring development will not have an adverse impact on the amenity of the waterside environment. This could be an additional paragraph in the supporting text as opposed to being within the policy itself, to keep the policy succinct.	The next version of the Local Plan will include a policy that better explains the approach to be taken to Retford town centre. This is expected to include more guidance on the town centre's relationship to the canal.
DBLP59	G Holland	Styrrup with Oldcotes Parish Council	The use of the word Train station in respect of Retford and Worksop railway stations is naive and childlike and not in keeping with an official document such as this.	The Plan is written in an easy to understand format so that it is accessible to as many people as possible. However, for consistency reference will be made instead to railway stations.
DBLP61	J Mann MP	Parliamentary Candidate for Bassetlaw	Propose that when future site allocation proposals come forward for Retford the Plan should include planning policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken Lane and the area around Tilt Lane, Bigsby Road and neighbouring streets.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP62	S Dalgliesh & C Jubb		In June 2018 we purchased a home on Sunningdale Road, Ordsall, as first time buyers. One of the driving factors was easy access to the countryside - surrounded by agricultural land, a golf course and woodlands - from Ordsall all the way to Clumber Park to the side, and Gamston to the front. Chose this over new build due to its location and how desirable the estate is to live on, and how overpriced all new builds are with no benefits over an older house. Expanding the borders of Retford specifically Ordsall towards Eaton/Gamston, would not only devalue our property significantly but would encourage us to sell our property and move out of Retford. This may seem insignificant but we are young professionals born in Retford and have chosen to invest in Retford town and live here for the foreseeable future. Expanding Retford's borders would not encourage young people to stay here and invest, but instead move from the town. The new builds being built are not affordable for young people even with government grants/schemes/help to buys and are only catering for commuters or people with significantly higher incomes than the young people of Retford. Retford is not able to cope with the amount of traffic that on the roads due to the expansions that have happened in Retford over the past few years on the Oval in Ordsall, Bridon in Ordsall, Whitehouse's Retford, King Edwards school Retford and Retford Leisure centre, and multiple more sites currently being built. To drive less than 2 miles from Ordsall to Retford town centre from 8am-10am and 3:30pm-5pm can take up to 45 minutes on weekdays. There is no resolution to this with no viable options to create new routes or expand on the current routes. Expanding the current borders would cause major disruption to the current residents of Retford but it would create significant safety hazards in areas like Ordsall primary school, Retford Oaks secondary school and Welbeck Road with the local shops like the Coop. Strongly oppose any border expansion of Retford borders particularly the edge of Ordsall, and feel that the opinions of Retford's current residents should be a high priority.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. An area of consideration will be the potential flood risk. All new housing development of 10 or more dwellings will need to provide a percentage of affordable housing to meet local needs.
DBLP67	A Middleton		Object to further substantial housing development beyond those numbers already agreed in Retford, as anything other than small in-fill developments, preferably on brownfield sites, would add unacceptable further pressure on roads that are designed and built for very much smaller vehicle movements, and which are already dangerously congested at peak times of day. In particular in Retford, there should be no more developments, either housing or industrial, which feed traffic onto Tilt Lane and the residential roads in the north-east quadrant of Retford. Oppose rural business developments off Smeath Lane, because they will feed more vehicle movements onto Smeath Lane and Tilt Lane, roads that are already inadequate in view of both car and HGV movements. Cannot conceive any new proposal for HGVs to use a small rural road being approved, thus the existing anomalous necessity must be addressed as a matter of urgency. Oppose any developments outside the current boundaries of Retford, particularly to the north and east of the town. Object to any further loss of agricultural land in the areas outside Retford's current boundaries. Urge that a long-term solution be explored with highways agencies and Network Rail to enable HGVs to use the A620 main route into Retford and thus stop the use by HGVs of the narrow, bendy and dangerous route via Tilt Lane/Smeath Lane. Surely lowering the road under the Welham bridge would be cost-effective! Urge an immediate analysis and action to address the dangers to children and parents of car and HGV movements past Carr Hill School, Retford.	Housing and employment land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP69	K Swinglehurst & B Stakes		It is important that the current boundaries of Retford are protected in order to avoid the town losing its geographic identity and merging with Welham, Hayton, Bolham, Barnby Moor, Little Gringley, and Eaton etc. Suggest that the Approved Plan should include policies which will specifically ensure the boundaries of Retford are safeguarded from future expansion. Specific reference should be made to protect the land adjoining Tilt Lane and Bigsby Road from further development. As residents of The Drive we are acutely aware of and affected by the existing pressures on local infrastructure in the Tilt Lane/Bigsby Road area, namely traffic and pedestrian volumes in and around the Carr Hill School.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP70	N and E Housego		As a resident of Bigsby Road, Retford, it is of utmost importance that the Bassetlaw Plan should explicitly state that there is to be no expansion of Retford beyond the current town boundaries. Specifically the agricultural land adjoining Bracken Lane and Ordsall. And importantly Tilt Lane, Bigsby Road and the neighbouring streets. This is essential because the safety of the traffic infrastructure is particularly compromised in this area, due to HGV use and the school.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority and Education Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP73	K Lamb		When future site allocation proposals come forward for Retford, the Bassetlaw Plan should include planning policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town, making specific reference to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall and Bracken Lane.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.

DBLP72	F and D Brown		Like to see that future site allocations proposals for Retford should also include planning policies that explicitly state there will be no more expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries with ref to the agricultural land Tln lane/Bigsby rd/Palmer rd, Bracken lane and Ordsal. Traffic is already a real problem for this small market town.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP93	A Avery		Should promote the use of Retford Town as a development area for a wide variety of residential accommodation and housing. The town centre and the immediate locality have a significant number of properties and sites that are vacant or only partially occupied. Encouraging development of these properties as accommodation would ensure the town centre thrives economically but also the greater number of people living in the area would improve security and reduce anti social behaviour. Development would need to be sympathetic to the character of the town but there are already some developments that have achieved this objective and more should be promoted. The Plan does not set this as an objective and it should do so. Once it is adopted innovative ways should be initiated by the Council to encourage owners and developers to make proposals for development rather than the long term deterioration that is occurring in some properties.	Policy 10 states that new housing will be supported in the development boundary on non allocated sites where appropriate. This would include sites in the town centre.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	The level of development proposed for Retford is 853 homes (13% of the overall housing requirement) is less than any other housing requirement despite being the second largest settlement in the district. There is extent permission for 511 dwellings at April 2018 which, after applying a lapse rate, would leave only 437 dwellings to be allocated for the plan period (26dpa). This will lead to the undue restriction of development towards the end of the plan period and leave no flexibility in the supply of housing land through the plan period to respond to change. The rationale behind such an extraordinarily low level of growth is not justified in the Local Plan and will undermine the role of the town as a key service centre for its population and its rural hinterland. The housing requirement for Retford equates to circa 50dpa over a 17 year plan period. Only once in the past 12 years (Table 2 in the 2016/17 AMR) has Retford delivered less than 50 dwellings a year and that in 2009/10 in a recession. Notwithstanding the recession, from 2005/06 to 2016/17 Retford averaged the delivery of 110dpa increasing to 152dpa in the 6 years since 2010/11 when recovery from the recession commenced. Retford has provided the backbone for the district's housing delivery which has struggled to meet its Core Strategy housing requirement. It is perverse for the Council to seek to deliver a level of growth at Retford which is below those seen across the recession, at a level less than a 1/3rd of delivery in the last 6 years (less than half delivered in the last 12 years) and which has been the best performing market area across a district that has struggled to deliver its housing requirement. That unduly low level of development is even more difficult to understand by failing to provide any substantive evidence for such a reduction and with excellent supply of suitable and developable Sites including land adjacent to the south of Retford identified as suitable in the LAA. In light of the Council's aspirations to connect with the SCR and D2N2 LEP regions, and to facilitate sustainable commuting patterns, it is unclear why it has not sought to boost the population above local needs at a town that para 10.3 identifies as having "excellent public transport links from Retford Bus Station, Retford Train Station [which provide] local and regional connections (...) to many towns and cities both regionally and nationally, including Worksop, Doncaster, Sheffield, Lincoln and London." The housing requirement for Retford also comprises only circa 9% increase in the number of homes in the District's second largest settlement; below the level of development proposed in the rural areas.	The Local Plan is proposing to deliver the same level of growth on an annual basis in Retford as the adopted Core Strategy. The Bassetlaw Core Strategy (2010 to 2028) identifies a requirement of 1574 dwellings for Retford. This equates to 87.4 dwellings per annum. The RSS found this was an appropriate amount for Retford. Projecting this forward to 2037 gives a housing requirement of 2360 dwellings from 2010 to 2037. Since 2010, 1057 dwellings have been delivered in Retford. There is currently land with permission for 571 dwellings in Retford and resolution to grant permission for a further 316 dwellings. The Council is proposing to allocate enough land to continue to meet the needs of Retford at 87.4 dwellings per annum (enough land to accommodate 420 dwellings). In addition to this, it is expected that there will continue to be a good supply of windfall sites.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	The development criteria in Policy 10 (a-g) are vague and there is little guidance as to how those development criteria will be applied - it is not clear when it would 'be applicable' for a development to have to (must) improve access and connectivity across the town by sustainable modes of transport. Encourage such provision where practicable however, the policy test for what is required and when is not clear. Support Part 1 of Policy 10 which notes that "Greenfield extensions to the built-up area of the town must be designed so as to enhance the urban-rural interface". The policy could be positively worded to encourage such extensions where there is an opportunity to enhance the urban-rural interface. Land to the south of Retford provides such an opportunity. Part 2 of Policy 10 (supported by para 10.8) lacks meaningful direction or aspiration for the economy of Retford. It apportions 15% of overall economic growth towards Retford with no meaningful strategy for doing so.	It is acknowledged that greater clarity and context for the development criteria would be beneficial. Support for Part 1 noted. The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure all types of economic growth and associated jobs can be delivered in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to employment growth will provide a clear strategy for economic growth including in Retford. The basis of the 15% target is the Council's Economic Development Needs Assessment.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Disagree with para 10.4 that the planned approach for Retford will deliver new housing and employment to meet the needs of the local community whilst supporting the role of the town centre. The level of growth proposed will have the contrary effect through unduly restricting growth at the town.	The approach taken to the spatial strategy is being reviewed in light of comments made during the Local Plan consultation.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Para 10.7 notes the importance of Retford as a core rural hub town and the need to deliver a significant amount of housing development over the plan period. It considers 853 dwellings to be an 'appropriate' level of development for the town. Disagree with that conclusion. Agree that growth should be delivered on sites in and on the edge of Retford. This is re-iterated within Part 1 of Policy 10 which we support.	The approach taken to the spatial strategy is being reviewed in light of comments made during the Local Plan consultation.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Para 10.10 sets out that it will require 'necessary infrastructure improvements' to be delivered by developers. Should be amended to clarify that those infrastructure improvements must directly relate to the proposed development to conform with the planning obligation tests set out at Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).	Accept that developers will only be required to make provision for infrastructure where it conforms with the three tests set out in the CIL Regulations 2010. Paragraph 10.10 will be amended accordingly.
DBLP143	George Breed	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	The second largest town within Bassetlaw, Retford enjoys a strong market town economy with good rail links, road network connections via the A1, good choice of schools with multiple employment sites. The Local Plan only seeks to apportion 853 homes to the area, of which 437 homes remain based on the proposed OAN figure. The Local Plan highlights past growth from 2011 – 2018 has been strong in Retford demonstrating strong market demand for housing in the town and yet the Local Plan apportionment of homes to Retford is comparatively low. The SHMA identifies Bassetlaw should allocate a total of 136Ha of Employment Land in order to sustain the continued economic growth of the District. Retford is required to accommodate 20Ha of employment land. 1ha of employment land per 48 homes delivered (6630 OAN / 136 Ha Employment = 48 homes per employment ha). Based on the Local Plan evidence the minimum housing target of 853 homes should read 975 homes (48 homes x 20 employment ha) if employment growth forecasts are to be supported in full. Given the strong performance of Retford to support the delivery of new homes in conjunction with SHMA employment growth evidence the comparatively low apportionment of homes for Retford over the plan period is contrary to evidence raising further questions on the effectiveness of the proposed spatial strategy model.	The approach taken to the spatial strategy is being reviewed in light of comments made during the Local Plan consultation. However, it should be noted that growth within the villages has been restricted in the Core Strategy so it is inevitable that Retford, as well as Worksop and Harworth experienced higher levels of growth as a consequence.
DBLP148	R Flounders	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	Sets out the Council's planned approach for Retford, which is to deliver new housing and employment to meet the needs of the local community, whilst also supporting the town's role as a core service centre for residents, surrounding rural communities and visitors, whilst conserving and enhancing the historic character or the market town. Support the planned approach set out for Retford in principle, but maintain the proposed housing distribution set out in Policy 2 does not support the planned approach set out in paragraph 10.4.	The approach taken to the spatial strategy is being reviewed in light of comments made during the Local Plan consultation.
DBLP148	R Flounders	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	Sets out principles for development and growth in Retford. The first bullet point states that where necessary the existing boundary around Retford will be redefined to accommodate site allocations. The second bullet point states that housing development and growth will be supported across Retford through planned site allocations and organic growth of a scale necessary to sustain and enhance the town's role as a rural-hub. Support these principles for the development and growth of Retford, but reiterate that the proposed housing distribution to Retford will not support these principles. The proposed distribution specifically constrains the growth of Retford, such that it will not support the town's role as a rural hub. There are no principles for Retford which indicate that it is proposed to constrain the levels of growth in this rural hub town, but this would be the effect of the proposed distribution policy.	The approach taken to the spatial strategy is being reviewed in light of comments made during the Local Plan consultation.
DBLP148	R Flounders	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	Acknowledges the Core Strategy apportioned 26% of the total growth to Retford and states that over the Core Strategy period 2011 to 2018, housing delivery has met housing need, and it is stated this indicates demand for housing in Retford is strong. Support this acknowledgement, but to support ongoing need and demand, the Local Plan should retain the housing distribution apportionment adopted in the Core Strategy of 26%.	The approach taken to the spatial strategy is being reviewed in light of comments made during the Local Plan consultation. However, it should be noted that the Core Strategy restricted growth within the villages and as a result Retford accommodated a greater proportion of housing over the plan period than is being proposed by this Local Plan which also proposes a more equitable apportionment of housing across the villages to promote sustainable development.

DBLP148	R Flounders	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	States that Retford is an important rural hub town and will continue to deliver a significant amount of housing development over the plan period and that Retford's housing requirement is 863 dwellings from 2018 - 2035 on sites in and on the edge of Retford. Support the growth of Retford and that sites on the edge of Retford will be needed. Object to the quantum of planned growth for Retford (853 dwellings / 13%), which is too low - Retford is the second largest town where demand for housing is strong. The final sentence of para 10.7 states that the new garden villages to the south of Retford will deliver development to address a percentage of the needs of the local housing market in Retford. Object to this approach. The two garden villages are new settlements in their own right. When delivered, they will form part of Rural Bassetlaw where 27% of the District's housing requirement is proposed, with the villages accounting for an additional 15% of the distribution. It is inappropriate for the proposed distribution to Retford to be reduced in the context of delivery proposed in the new garden villages, as they are distinct settlements and in different tiers of the hierarchy. The Plan sets out the role and function of Retford as a Rural Hub which supports surrounding villages. The level of proposed growth in/adjacent to Retford should support its role and function as the second largest settlement in the hierarchy to accord with sustainable development principles. Should retain the 26% distribution in the Core Strategy. The Council's evidence at the Core Strategy examination (Council's Matter 5 Statement – May 2011) q10, "Why should not more/less of the split go to Retford", states: "The proportion of allocated growth proposed for Retford is 26%. This percentage share reflects Retford's role as the second key growth settlement for growth, which should accommodate the second highest proportion of planned growth in line with the aims of the RSS (RD01) and the Core Strategy's Spatial Strategy. The Council does not believe that higher levels of growth over and above this proportion are required to sustain Retford's role or are desirable in light of the levels of development delivered in recent years. Lower levels would not be appropriate in relation to Retford's role and would be unlikely to accord with the RSS." The proposed approach seeks to allow part of Retford's growth to be delivered in two villages. Yet delivering part of Retford's need outside of Retford will not support the services and facilities in Retford in the same way as housing delivered in Retford would. It is clear that the new villages will be sustainable communities (policy 1) and independent settlements (para 12.2), which will provide opportunities for economic growth (para 12.8). Policy 12 identifies that the villages will have a village hub (convenience retail / services), employment and community facilities. The new villages will function no differently to established villages will be independently functioning settlements, functioning no differently from existing villages with Retford acting as a rural hub. The 're-direction' of growth from Retford to these villages is unjustified. A higher proportion of growth should be for Retford to directly support this settlement and meet its needs. If propose to 're-direct growth' to enable the delivery of the garden villages, it is the growth of existing rural villages that should be reduced, as this is the tier of the hierarchy the garden villages will sit within. The distribution proposes to focus the majority of growth in the rural settlements by virtue of the growth of existing villages and the delivery of two new villages contrary to sustainable development principles. The majority of housing growth should be delivered in the largest two existing towns and distribution to Retford should be increased to 26%, which is the minimum proportion the Council states was required to support the role of Retford when the Core Strategy was prepared.	The Local Plan is proposing to deliver the same level of growth on an annual basis in Retford as the adopted Core Strategy. The Bassetlaw Core Strategy (2010 to 2028) identifies a requirement of 1574 dwellings for Retford. This equates to 87.4 dwellings per annum. The RSS found this was an appropriate amount for Retford. Projecting this forward to 2037 gives a housing requirement of 2360 dwellings from 2010 to 2037. Since 2010, 1057 dwellings have been delivered in Retford. There is currently land with permission for 571 dwellings in Retford and resolution to grant permission for a further 316 dwellings. The Council is proposing to allocate enough land to continue to meet the needs of Retford at 87.4 dwellings per annum (enough land to accommodate 420 dwellings). In addition to this, it is expected that there will continue to be a good supply of windfall sites.
DBLP148	R Flounders	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	Object to Policy 10 which seeks to deliver only 13% (853 dwellings) to Retford. The proposed distribution will not meet the needs of Retford and will not support its role and function. The level of growth proposed (13%) is half of the proportion adopted in the Core Strategy (26%) on the basis that the new garden villages will meet part of Retford's need. It is inappropriate to deliver such a low proportion of the requirement in the second largest settlement in the context of this being a settlement where there is high demand for housing. The Council's evidence to the Core Strategy was also clear that apportioning less than 26% of the housing requirement to Retford would not support its role. For the plan to be sound, Retford should accommodate 26% (1,706 dwellings) with the delivery of the garden villages forming part of the proposed distribution to the rural villages (where 27% of the housing is to be distributed). The distribution to the new garden villages should not be in addition to the distribution to rural villages. These amendments, would support the settlement hierarchy and the spatial strategy for the District.	The Local Plan is proposing to deliver the same level of growth on an annual basis in Retford as the adopted Core Strategy. The Bassetlaw Core Strategy (2010 to 2028) identifies a requirement of 1574 dwellings for Retford. This equates to 87.4 dwellings per annum. The RSS found this was an appropriate amount for Retford. Projecting this forward to 2037 gives a housing requirement of 2360 dwellings from 2010 to 2037. Since 2010, 1057 dwellings have been delivered in Retford. There is currently land with permission for 571 dwellings in Retford and resolution to grant permission for a further 316 dwellings. The Council is proposing to allocate enough land to continue to meet the needs of Retford at 87.4 dwellings per annum (enough land to accommodate 420 dwellings). In addition to this, it is expected that there will continue to be a good supply of windfall sites.
DBLP150	C Grainger		Would like to see no more new Out of Boundary developments on land currently used for agriculture. Would also like to see improvement to the infrastructure in Retford. In particular the traffic flow around the town. Moved here in 1990 whilst there has been a reasonable growth in housing, the volume of traffic has at least doubled and there has been no improvements to alleviate congestion, trying to get around the town morning, night or school times it is grid locked with queues at all traffic lights with queues along London Rd. to the Whitehouse's and from North Rd roundabout to Babworth. West St should be extended from Asda to join up with Hospital Rd following a route close to the Chesterfield Canal to minimise the loss to Kings Park. This would eliminate the need for traffic from London Rd going to Workop or the A1 north or visa-versa having to go all the way around town Arlington Way and Amcott Way through 6 sets of traffic lights and would take pressure off North Rd roundabout. It would require a new bridge over the river Idle. There is an alternative route down Albert Rd. Queen St but it is unusable for any volume of traffic or larger vehicles because residents have to park on the road. Replace the traffic lights at London Rd Arlington Way with a roundabout. Currently trying to get from Arlington Way to the train station is a nightmare. Would like the traffic lights at Amcott Way, Moorgate and Arlington Way replaced with a roundabout - queues stretch as far as Longholme Rd. The Morrison traffic lights should be removed and that junction should be made no right turns, only left in and left out making use of the new roundabout it would only add about 200 meters to most journeys but would make things flow much better.	Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford will only be available as part part of the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP158	H Godley	Fisher German on behalf of T Strawson and D Horrocks	States that the Council will support the delivery of sustainable development to meet the needs of Retford over the plan period. Where applicable, a number of criteria (a. to g.) must be satisfied by proposed development. Consider these criteria to be typical of development policies across the country, as well as being consistent with national policy. Note that the policy states that the requirement for 853 dwellings in Retford is a minimum. This is supported. Retford should be allocated significantly more development than outlined by the Draft Plan. Retford in the Core Strategy was designated to receive almost a quarter of the District's housing requirement. This has been artificially restricted within the emerging Local Plan, without merit or proper justification. Retford is demonstrably one of the most sustainable settlements in the District. It has a strong housing market which is likely to be representative of high housing need and should receive a level of growth commensurate with this sustainability. Do not consider there is sufficient justification or merit to warrant this step-change, which seems to be informed more by local politics than sound planning rationale. Support the housing requirement for Retford will be delivered through existing planning permissions and new site allocations in the Plan. The land north of Bracken Lane is an available and deliverable site which is suitable for allocation in the Plan. Policy 10 also states that the Council will support new housing on non-allocated sites within the development boundary of Retford. Support this, but consider that the plan should also contain policies that ensure flexibility should the housing requirement not be met and which facilitate development on unallocated sites adjoining the development boundary, subject to meeting a number of criteria. This would enable the Council to refuse inappropriate development, whilst meeting its housing needs should any of the allocations not deliver.	The approach taken to the spatial strategy is being reviewed in light of comments made during the Local Plan consultation. However, it should be noted that the Core Strategy restricted growth within the villages and as a result Retford accommodated a greater proportion of housing over the plan period than is being proposed by this Local Plan which also proposes a more equitable apportionment of housing across the villages to promote sustainable development. Housing land availability is being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Further consideration will be given to the assessment of non allocated sites adjacent to settlement boundaries.
DBLP169	I Herring	Avant Homes (Central) and Wyndthorpe Developments Ltd	As acknowledged in the preamble to 'Policy 10' and at para 10.6, the demand for housing in Retford has been strong since the start of the Core Strategy period, with the existing plan target of 26% proportionate growth having been met. The explanatory text adds that as the District's second largest town, Retford benefits from a wide range of community infrastructure, facilities and services, forming a sustainable area for growth. The 'excellent public transport links' from Retford Bus Station, and Retford Train Station are further highlighted. From Paras 10.6 to 10.7, the previous apportionment of 26% residual growth in the Core Strategy is noted, there is little explanation as to why the revised spatial distribution has radically diverted growth away from the town. Para 10.7 makes reference to the identified 'garden villages' south of Retford, noting that these are considered to address a percentage of local housing market needs. The identified garden villages represent new isolated settlements which are substantially detached from the centre of Retford. The 'Gamston Airport' site is located over 2km from the south of Ordsall and around 5km from the centre of Retford, falling well outside of MFS preferred walking distances from existing amenities. This site will be heavily dependant on short term private vehicle use and will require significant sustainable transport infrastructure to connect with existing local amenities. Bevercotes Colliery is located over 8km from the centre of Retford and arguably bears little influence over meeting housing need within Retford, given it is equally located within similar distance Ollerton (Newark & Sherwood District). The NPPF is clear that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The Council recognise that Retford is a sustainable location, opportunities for sustainable growth should be maximised accordingly, particularly given the NPPF's objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing. There is a danger that failure to do so in this regard would render the plan unsound failing to meet the relevant tests, notably that it has not been positively prepared and that it is not effective or consistent with national policy.	The Local Plan is proposing to deliver the same level of growth on an annual basis in Retford as the adopted Core Strategy. The Bassetlaw Core Strategy (2010 to 2028) identifies a requirement of 1574 dwellings for Retford. This equates to 87.4 dwellings per annum. The RSS found this was an appropriate amount for Retford. Projecting this forward to 2037 gives a housing requirement of 2360 dwellings from 2010 to 2037. Since 2010, 1057 dwellings have been delivered in Retford. There is currently land with permission for 571 dwellings in Retford and resolution to grant permission for a further 316 dwellings. The Council is proposing to allocate enough land to continue to meet the needs of Retford at 87.4 dwellings per annum (enough land to accommodate 420 dwellings). In addition to this, it is expected that there will continue to be a good supply of windfall sites.
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	Support the inclusion of increasing climate change resilience through good quality design and protecting, conserving or enhancing Green Infrastructure in developments in Retford.	Support for criterion a and g welcome.

DBLP195	J Beverley	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of The Holy and Undivided Trinity	Consider the criteria in Policy 10 to be typical of development policies across the country, as well as being consistent with national policy. Note that the requirement for 853 dwellings in Retford is a minimum. The use of the term minimum is supported. Clearly, it is the intention of the NPPF to assist in boosting the supply of housing significantly, as outlined at Paragraph 59 (2018). Paragraph 60 continues that Local Planning authorities should determine the minimum number of homes needed. Consider the minimum threshold for Retford should be significantly greater than that proposed by the Plan. The Core Strategy sought to deliver a quarter of the District's housing requirement in Retford. This was considered a sound approach and reflected Retford's role in the District. The housing requirement for Retford, set out in the emerging Plan appears to have been artificially restricted, without merit or proper justification. Retford is demonstrably one of the most sustainable settlements in the District, a fact recognised by the District's Spatial Strands. It has a recent record of being strong housing market area, which is likely to be representative of high housing need. Retford should receive a level of growth commensurate its sustainability and likely housing need. Do not consider there is sufficient justification or merit to warrant the Plans proposed step-change in the future growth of Retford. This decision seems to be informed more by local politics than sound planning rationale. It is noted that the local MP has differing views to those prescribed by National policy, however it is the Framework which should form the basis of plan making. Consider that the Land at North Road should be included in the development boundary, due to its forthcoming permission, consider that the Plan should also include a policy which allows for non-allocated land adjacent to the development boundary to come forward, if allocations have failed to deliver or can be shown demonstrably to be non-deliverable. This policy position ensures delivery and flexibility are built into the plan, without the need for review. This could be tied into the Council's proposed trajectory to ensure developers adhere to the timescales set, ensuring housing delivery.	The Local Plan is proposing to deliver the same level of growth on an annual basis in Retford as the adopted Core Strategy. The Bassetlaw Core Strategy (2010 to 2028) identifies a requirement of 1574 dwellings for Retford. This equates to 87.4 dwellings per annum. The RSS found this was an appropriate amount for Retford. Projecting this forward to 2037 gives a housing requirement of 2360 dwellings from 2010 to 2037. Since 2010, 1057 dwellings have been delivered in Retford. There is currently land with permission for 571 dwellings in Retford and resolution to grant permission for a further 316 dwellings. The Council is proposing to allocate enough land to continue to meet the needs of Retford at 87.4 dwellings per annum (enough land to accommodate 420 dwellings). In addition to this, it is expected that there will continue to be a good supply of windfall sites.
DBLP226	B Barnett	Retford Civic Society	Support efforts to attract new industry and sources of employment into Retford and welcomes the proposal to develop land on North Road for employment uses.	Support for Part 2 welcome.
DBLP251	Mr & Mrs Wagstaff		When future sites allocation proposals come forward for Retford the Bassetlaw Plan should include planning policies that explicitly state that there will be no expansion of Retford beyond the current boundaries of the town. Specific reference should be made to the agricultural land adjoining Ordsall, Bracken lane and Tiltan lane areas of the town.	Housing land availability is currently being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford has been reviewed as part of the development of the Local Plan. Some amendments are being proposed to enable new development to be accommodated.
DBLP238	D Owen		When future site allocations proposals take place, that the Bassetlaw Plan should include policy that clearly states that no future housing will be constructed which would increase the current boundary of Retford. In particular reference any agricultural land within or on the boundary of Retford town.	Housing land availability is currently being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford has been reviewed as part of the development of the Local Plan. Some amendments are being proposed to enable new development to be accommodated.
DBLP245	P Bland		Most concerned about the way in which the policies will be applied to applications in Retford. Major developments for industrial or commercial development should address the availability of appropriate housing for potential employees and vice versa where substantial housing applications are made the applicants should address the questions of appropriate employment opportunities and the availability of necessary local facilities to meet the needs of new residents. Applications on agricultural land or greenfield sites to the east and north of the Retford boundary on the local Plan map 1995 will be rejected unless in exceptional circumstances until such time as essential infrastructure work and further town amenities have been provided. Retford have covered their building quota five years hence based on old boundary plans.	The Economic Development Needs Assessment identifies the links between the number of new homes and the expected amount of employment land required as a result in particular broad locations. Housing land availability is currently being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. An area of consideration will be the loss of high quality agricultural land. The proposed development boundary for Retford has been reviewed as part of the development of the Local Plan. Some amendments are being proposed to enable new development to be accommodated.
DBLP267	D Backhouse	Sustrans Bassetlaw Rangers	3 Town Centre, i. accessibility to the wider area is rightly a high priority, but equally is provision of a north-south cycle link (Bridgegate – Chancery Lane) across the town centre away from the principal highway corridor (ring road), the absence of which is a major obstacle to cycle use within Retford. A route west from the town centre via West Street, the Carrs, Pelham Road, West Carr Road and into Ordsall, potentially across the Sandhills, should be considered as an element of this project since, not only would it form a link to the town centre from the Ordsall area but also one route to Retford from the Garden Villages via Ollerton Road. The table on page 81 quotes an evidence source (5) as the Harworth & Bircotes Neighbourhood Plan; is this correct or merely a 'cut & paste' oversight?	The Bassetlaw Transport Study will be updated to inform the next version of the Local Plan. This will include cycle routes. The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure transport infrastructure can remain operational and can accommodate changes in use over the plan period. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to transport will provide a clear approach for all types of transport provision including for sustainable transport. The list of evidence on p81 should not include reference to the Harworth and Bircotes Neighbourhood Plan.
DBLP289	968479		Support for all policies. Traffic queues in Retford are unsustainable. Consider a bypass as part of the plans. Can't make use of leisure facilities in the evening.	Housing land availability is currently being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required.
DBLP300	975933		No support for any policy. Retford and the rural areas are not the place for new housing. The focus should be on deprived areas. Shops are shutting down and people do not have the disposable income in this area. People move to an area for various reasons. This changes the landscape and communities.	New housing should be focussed in the more sustainable locations which includes Retford, as well as Worksoy and Harworth. To ensure that these main towns are not required to accommodate an unsustainable amount of housing the Local Plan proposes to equitably distribute housing amongst the villages. The closure of shops is a national trend. Housing land availability is currently being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford and in a mix of income areas) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP352	988350		Strongly object to further housing developments which will spoil a great part of Retford's history as well as destroy and increase unemployment in the area by eliminating the aerodrome businesses. Retford already has a large number of housing developments with an infrastructure which is already struggling to cope.	New housing should be focussed in the more sustainable locations which includes Retford. The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Garston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP98	989658		No support. It would be better to spend the money on improving current local provision, education, medical, transport, housing, employment, rather than trying to entice more people into the area without sufficient employment and services to support the current growing population never mind thousands more. Centre of Retford is already clogged with traffic during busy times.	The Economic Development Needs Assessment identifies that the amount of employment land proposed is consistent with the amount of housing proposed. New major development will be expected to ensure provision of infrastructure to meet the needs of their development, this could include education, health and transport. Housing land availability is currently being assessed (and will include a number of sites submitted for consideration in Retford) which will inform appropriate and deliverable site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. Part of this process involves consultation with infrastructure providers such as the Highways Authority who will determine whether the number of houses proposed can be accommodated by existing infrastructure and whether mitigation is required.
Policy 11: Harworth & Bircotes				
DBLP19	Mrs Davies	Harworth and Bircotes Town Council	Note that the Plan identifies Harworth and Bircotes as the Local Regeneration Town - the growth in new housing and employment opportunities in recent years supports this. It is recognised that the development of the brownfield site that was Haworth Colliery is ongoing; agree that the appearance of new houses needs to be accompanied by further employment opportunities to ensure viability and to this end look to the future development of Harworth South.	The Council welcomes support for this policy.
DBLP19	Mrs Davies	Harworth and Bircotes Town Council	Social housing has recently been developed in Harworth and Bircotes with the appearance of Housing Association homes and new Council houses that replaced older Council dwellings. There are also properties available for rent from private landlords. However there is always a demand for accommodation for our growing number of older residents; the Town Council hopes for assistance with the issue if a potential opportunity is proven viable. The Town Council hopes to see a future focus on homes suitable for the elderly within all housing developments. Private housing is attracting in-migration to the Town but a common complaint is that there are no bungalows to purchase. Unattractive as they are to developers there is an obvious need and market for bungalows; residents who own their own houses wish to downsize in preparation for their retirement. It would be interesting to discover what could be done in the future to persuade developers to address this obvious need.	The Housing Mix Policy seeks to ensure that the housing needs of the elderly population are addressed. The Council will also continue to work with partner agencies and the community to take advantage of opportunities to address the housing needs of the elderly community.
DBLP19	Mrs Davies	Harworth and Bircotes Town Council	The Plan identifies that the regeneration of the town centre requires attention to both retail and infrastructure. Policy 11 states that there is no requirement for expansion of the Primary Shopping Area including new retail floorspace. The Town Council strongly disagrees with this. Expert market analysis of the Town Centre identifies the need for further retail development; the current retail layout resembles a 'seaside town' design with retail outlets along the northern side of Scrooby Road. The recommendation is to create further retail units on the southern side of the main shopping area thus creating a more balanced High Street (Report from Aspinall Verdi, Harworth and Bircotes Town Centre: Growth plan). The comments in the Plan should be corrected to reflect the need for a better balance of retail availability in the main shopping area.	The Plan does not restrict the expansion of the town centre, it supports retail development on the edge of the centre. The Plan is simply seeking to ensure the existing centre continues to function as a retail and service hub for the community.
DBLP19	Mrs Davies	Harworth and Bircotes Town Council	Ongoing planned growth of Harworth and Bircotes supporting the regeneration of the Town demands changes and improvements to the current infrastructure - para 11.13 states the normal route to achieve infrastructure improvements is 'via direct onsite provision and developer contributions.' In terms of regeneration of the Town Centre there is a need to mitigate the impact of large scale housing growth in Harworth on the current infrastructure and implement: - improvements to Harworth Crossroads - this is a main junction for five roads facilitated by two mini roundabouts, it is a key point of access to the Town, the Town Centre and Bircotes and the A1M. It has been under discussion with NCC for the last decade: the evident and growing pressure from traffic and the need for a better system of traffic control is paramount to the delivery of further growth of the Town. - A new design for improvement traffic management and pedestrian safety in the main shopping area: a Traffic Management Plan (Via). Implementation would control vehicular traffic, increase pedestrian safety, establish connectivity with Simpson Park for vehicles and pedestrians - a must do and support retail and local economy and enhance the retail experience. Town Council recognise that these improvements are necessary for successful regeneration and is aware that local opinion which has been supportive of housing growth and particularly Simpson Park is now questioning further growth without infrastructure improvements. Also recognise that the costs will not be met by developer contributions alone. These two major infrastructure schemes are integral to future regeneration, are key to underpinning the desired balance between housing, employment and retail and should be highlighted in the Plan.	The Bassetlaw Transport Study will be updated to inform the next version of the Local Plan. This will include proposed mitigation to infrastructure where necessary. The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure transport infrastructure can remain operational and can accommodate future development in Bassetlaw.
DBLP90	M Grant	Lichfields on behalf of db symmetry Ltd	Assume that Symmetry Park is considered as part of the employment land supply for Harworth & Bircotes. This is how it is in the EDNA. Should this be incorrect happy to advise on how the strategy should be amended. Notwithstanding the approach taken within the EDNA, Policy 11 is vague and it is not clear whether or not Symmetry Park is included. Policy 11 states that at least 38 Ha of employment land and associated infrastructure will be delivered in Harworth & Bircotes and "on land extending towards the A1 to the south". This lacks any firm definition. It could include Symmetry Park, there is no clarity as to whether this is the case. 'Towards' might be construed as not meaning 'up to' which would be clearer. At the very minimum, the supporting text should be amended to define the area that is referred to. Suggest wording of: "...on land to the south of Harworth & Bircotes extending down into the parish of Blyth up to Junction 34 of the A1(M)." Para 11.10 should be updated to make it clear that land in and around Harworth & Bircotes also refers to land falling within the parish of Blyth. The EDNA considers Symmetry Park as to be one of the district's most important employment sites and a key contributor to the District's employment land supply throughout the plan period. When considering the 22 sites assessed in the EDNA, paragraph 9.8 states: "Of these 22 sites, 6 sites are considered to be Key Employment Sites – Claylands Avenue, Manton Colliery, Manton Wood East and West, Sandy Lane Estate and Symmetry Park. These are the most important sites for employment uses in the district and should be retained as such. Employment uses at these sites should be protected and development for alternative uses should be resisted." Table 17 of the EDNA identifies Symmetry Park as the only 'key strategic employment site' in Harworth & Bircotes. It is not possible to discern from the DBLP if Symmetry Park has been accounted for in the 38 ha of employment land for Harworth & Bircotes - welcome clarity on this. If Symmetry Park is considered to be a commitment and has not been considered as part of the future land requirement set out within the policy then the supporting text should make this clear.	The policy recognises that Symmetry park is a important employment site and will be allocated as such in the emerging Local Plan. The employment land contributes towards the district employment need and not for any specific settlement.
DBLP91	S Freek	Highways England	Highways England has previously engaged with NCC and the Council regarding the impact of growth in the Harworth & Bircotes area, particularly on A1134. Concluded that the planned NCC junction improvement scheme would mitigate the impact of growth proposed in this location. However, should further development be proposed in the area, over and above current allocations, Highways England considers that it will be necessary to review the impact of this further growth on this junction.	The Bassetlaw Transport Study will be updated to inform the next version of the Local Plan. This will include proposed mitigation to infrastructure where necessary. The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure transport infrastructure can remain operational and can accommodate future development in Bassetlaw. HE will be a consultee in this process.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Support the more positive approach taken towards planning for growth at Harworth and Bircotes. Welcome the acknowledgement of the Core Strategy Vision in para 11.6 which sought a step change at the town. Note this a step change in housing growth and linked employment development, taking advantage of ready access to the A1 (to the south) and close proximity to neighbouring Doncaster. Support a continuation of a positive strategy but consider that the Local Plan needs to further consider how economic growth can be the driving force for the above stepchange which will in turn require an uplift in the number of homes both at Harworth and Bircotes but also across the wider District. Accept that the proposed levels of growth of 1400 homes (circa 40% growth from the towns current size) is a reasonable expectation for growth at Harworth with a modest level of economic growth as predicted by the EDNA. Should encourage the delivery of employment land Harworth significantly in excess of the 38ha of employment land proposed as the minimum target within Policy 11. The level of housing growth promoted at Harworth and the other main settlements within the District should be significantly increased within the Local Plan to encourage that delivery. In the event that the economic growth of the District does not make a step-change, levels of housing growth required to support such economic growth will not be delivered. Policy 11 (criteria a-g) should be re-drafted to remove ambiguity. Support Part 1 of Policy 11 the delivery of housing in an appropriate mix for the local area. However, the Council point to the SHMA 2017 to provide that guidance which does not form the basis for the Local Plan's housing requirement. The Local Plan seek to provide an evidenced base approach to housing mix needs that is reflective of the housing requirement to be provided; and a mechanism for review of that evidence. At Part 2 support the identification of land to the south of Harworth (towards the A1) for the delivery of employment land. This land, including land to the south of Snape Lane, should form a strategic employment allocation within the Part 1 Local Plan. Support Part 2 of Policy 11 which seeks to encourage employment development to meet unexpected demand. Unexpected demand must be matched by housing growth. At the very least, the Council's housing policies should contain a similar mechanism to support an increase in housing land in the event of unexpected growth occurring.	Agreed. Housing and employment growth will be broadly balanced to support the needs of the district. Snape Lane will be identified as a strategic employment site in the emerging Local Plan to address the step change in growth of the local economy.

DBLP147	R Irving	ID Planning on behalf of The Harworth Group	The policy establishes the Council will support the delivery of sustainable development to meet the needs of Harworth and Bircotes over the plan period. It emphasises prioritisation will be given to opportunities for the regeneration and enhancement of the former Harworth Colliery site and we clearly support this stem of the policy. In respect of housing, the policy goes onto advise Harworth and Bircotes will grow to accommodate a minimum of 1,400 new dwellings and deliver the associated infrastructure from 2018 to 2035. This stem of the policy is supported and the current planning application for land off Scrooby Road and North of Snape Lane, Harworth will deliver development in accordance with the aims and aspirations of this policy.	Support for policy welcomed.
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	Support the inclusion of increasing climate change resilience through good quality design and protecting, conserving or enhancing Green Infrastructure in developments in Harworth & Bircotes.	Support for policy welcomed.
DBLP192	B Lomas	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	Appropriate to maintain Harworth & Bircotes as a Local Regeneration Centre. Should take a proactive approach to development within the settlement to ensure that appropriate delivery is supported to facilitate the economic and social aspirations for the area. Acknowledge that Harworth & Bircotes benefits from a made Neighbourhood Plan and is appropriate that this should be referenced in the policy. Harworth scores poorly in the Index of Deprivation. In almost all indicators including (but not limited to) employment, income, health, housing and living environment, Harworth ward results in higher levels of deprivation than the District average and the national average. Of the five data areas comprising Harworth ward three are ranked within the most deprived 30% areas in the country and one is identified as within the most deprived 20%. Direct investment in the settlement will assist in improving the overall housing stock, assist in the drive to raise health and education standards, facilitate the improvement of existing services and facilities and aid in the provision of services where gaps are identified. The ward of Harworth has the second highest percentage of working age population claiming out of work benefits in the District. The commitment of at least 25% of the District's employment land needs to be delivered in this area is welcomed. This should be seen as a minimum. Given the conclusions of the EDNA, which prioritises meeting needs and providing an uplift along the A1 corridor Harworth's strategic location on the A1 places it well to deliver such aspirations. In contrast, the distribution of dwellings (1400 dwellings or 21%) is reflective of the regeneration aspiration and the settlement should be apportioned a higher level of residential distribution to boost investment within the area and compliment the proposed economic growth. The table at 11.8 sets out a total of 1,081 dwellings planning consents in Harworth & Bircotes (as at 1st April 2018). It is noted the same is set out for other settlements. There is no evidence base setting out these known consents. A list of the sites contributing to the known planning consents should be included as an appendix. These comments apply to tables in Sections 2 and 8 – 11. Should the requested evidence corroborate the figures in the table, this is clear evidence of developer interest in Harworth and its ability to deliver the District's housing needs. Unless additional homes are distributed to the Town, could see a position where one of the District's key housing supply lines could be "cut off" within the early stages of the Local Plan period.	Agreed. Housing and employment growth will be broadly balanced to support the needs of the district. Appropriate employment land will be identified in the emerging Local Plan to address the step change in growth of the local economy.
DBLP235	J Durdy		Much attention has been given to the proposed housing allocation within Harworth and Bircotes, but there is scant detail or provision for road improvements which are necessary to facilitate this. The mini roundabouts in Old Harworth cannot cope with the predicted traffic, supported by a number of recently submitted traffic surveys. Scrooby Road, which is the main route to the supermarkets and Bircotes suffers severe congestion at peak times of the day, coinciding with school drop off/pick ups. The proposed new route along the former pit road, South of Jones Homes Woodland Grange must be upgraded to a main road/bus route between Asda and Blyth Road to alleviate traffic congestion on both Scrooby Road and the twin Harworth roundabouts. Subsequent residential development of land to the West of Blyth Road could complement this by allowing the creation of a new strategic transport link to Styrrup Road, South of the new cemetery. This is NCC Highway's preferred option, which would see a pedestrian controlled crossing at Blyth Road and footpath/cycle route to Styrrup Road/New Cemetery. This would eliminate a large proportion of traffic using Main Street and allow traffic traveling South along Tickhill Road to flow more freely at the roundabouts. The added benefit would be a safe pedestrian/wheelchair access route to the new cemetery. Footpath access along Main Street is restricted to able bodied pedestrians due to narrow footpaths and cars parked on the footpath by the Blacksmiths Arms pub/shops.	The Bassetlaw Transport Study will be updated to inform the next version of the Local Plan. This will include proposed mitigation to infrastructure where necessary. The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure transport infrastructure can remain operational and can accommodate future development in Bassetlaw.
DBLP235	J Durdy		The row of shops on Scrooby Road are in need of improvement. The poor layout/design and lack of maintenance by absentee landlords does not help. Deliveries to the shops have to be made from Scrooby Road, due to the poor state of the access Road to the rear of the shops, which does not appear to be improved or maintained. Harworth/Bircotes is not a Market Town like Tickhill or Bawtry and the massive increase in housing will do nothing to provide a much needed boost to the current retail outlets in the short term, as parking is inadequate and the range of shops is considered poor and repetitive. Accept retail outlets will adapt to supply and demand, this process will take years. The colliery site should have had an allocation of retail outlets to the rear of the Town Hall/Asda to compliment the Town Centre. The decision to allocate planning permission for sole residential use to the colliery site was poor and there is now a distinct lack of vacant land for new retail outlets within walking distance of the Town Centre. Any new out of town retail opportunities should not face planning refusals due to the envisaged competition with Harworth Town Centre. Appreciate efforts have to be made to revitalise the existing Harworth shops, do not and cannot offer the same facilities an out of town centre can. There are a large number of families relocating from around the country and they will expect more amenities, feeling disappointed and relatively short changed if these are not forthcoming.	Policies are in place to enable the town centre to expand if there is demand from the retail sector. The town centre continues to function as a key service centre for Harworth and Bircotes. The Retail Study does not identify a need to expand the centre. As such, there is no evidence to support this approach.
DBLP235	J Durdy		The current and proposed housing developments are predominately large scale and located in two specific areas of the town. Future developments ought to be smaller scale and more evenly distributed around the settlement borders. Not to everyone desires to live on a large sprawling estate. There are too many 3/4 bedroom detached properties planned or under construction. These properties sell at over £200,000 and whilst providing significant profit for the builders, are out of reach to the majority of the local population. A greater emphasis should be placed on affordable by nature of build homes. Two bedroom semi detached properties and 2 bedroom quarter houses would be more suitable for first time buyers and local people. The latter offering 4 smaller scale and more affordable homes on a similar footprint to a traditional 2/3 bedroom semi detached property. The 2 bedroom properties have always been the first to sell in all the recent developments. Bungalows have been consistently requested by the local population, to little or no avail. Understand they are less profitable for builders and land hungry. Where there is a specific demand should be fulfilled. The lack of bungalows for sale and the effortless nature of which they sell, often exceeding the asking price confirms this. Development proposals that offer an increased ratio of bungalows to houses should be prioritised when considering site allocations and planning consents, as is the case with government approved affordable homes.	The Housing Mix Policy seeks to ensure that the housing needs of the local community are addressed. Neighbourhood Planning provides an opportunity for communities to undertake an assessment of local housing need and implement policies to deliver the type of properties needed to some extent. However, policies must be deliverable and developers are likely to want to deliver a good mix of housing types.
DBLP235	J Durdy		The Green Wheel is an ambitious proposal and well received by local people, relies on strategically placed housing developments to allow the route to be designed, funded and constructed. Without said developments in place around the boundary of Harworth/Bircotes, it is likely to face opposition from land owners, who will more than likely be unhappy with the proposals. This is the case with the South West section of the green wheel, without which it will be more of a horse shoe or a crescent.	The Green Wheel is supported by the Council, but this is an issue for the Harworth and Bircotes Town Council and the Neighbourhood Plan and not the Local Plan.
DBLP235	J Durdy		Development is planned to replace the ex council airy houses on Common Lane, no further developments have yet been proposed for Low Common Lane, further West. This area has become increasingly popular over the years for dog walking/recreation. It is a section of un-adopted road without a footpath. It is heavily used by agricultural vehicles and is becoming increasingly dangerous for the public, particularly children. Trespassing across agricultural fields is common, with scant regard for any damage caused and no thought of the health risks of pesticide applications which may have been made to growing crops. Fly tipping is at epidemic proportions in this area as is the problem of illegal motorbikes. A smaller scale development, sympathetic to the surroundings, with a sufficient buffer from the A1 would benefit this area and provide a degree of ownership to this part of the village. It would allow the green wheel to circumnavigate a large part of the missing link.	The Council is not proposing to allocate land for housing in Harworth & Bircotes. There is a significant amount of development with planning permission which should meet the needs of the local community. The Neighbourhood Planning process will enable the local community to allocate new sites in Harworth and Bircotes.
DBLP251	Mr & Mrs Wagstaff		Support the proposals for housing in Haworth.	Support for the policy is welcomed.
DBLP290	969442		Support for all policies. Query about Harworth (are the homes currently being built included in the 1400 home requirement?). Query regarding GP services - are they able to accommodate people moving into the new homes? Concern that no homes will be built if the incinerator gets the go ahead.	Yes, the homes currently being built and with planning permission will address the housing requirement in Harworth & Bircotes. The Council will continue to work with our CCG/NHS partners to ensure there is sufficient capacity for the new developments.
Policy 12: North Nottinghamshire Villages				
DBLP3	Mr P Crawley		Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed with the potential of further increasing the proposed numbers at a future date. This would reduce the need for as many additional houses in Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP4	Mrs E Crawley		Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed with the potential of further increasing the proposed numbers at a future date. This would reduce the need for as many additional houses in Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP5	Mr B Crawley		Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed with the potential of further increasing the proposed numbers at a future date. This would reduce the need for as many additional houses in Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP6	Mr & Mrs C Fletcher		Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed and support a larger number of houses being built on these sites as opposed to the numbers being put forward for Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP8	J Kerley		Agree that the creation of two new villages which are identified on the Plan should be on the proposed sites and again these would be ideal for larger numbers of houses to be built.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP9	Mr & Mrs T Noble		Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed, indeed support a larger number of houses being built on these sites as opposed to the numbers being put forward for Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP10	Mr & Mrs P West		Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed, indeed support a larger number of houses being built on these sites as opposed to the numbers being put forward for Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP11	Mr & Mrs S Wilson		Support the creation of two new 'dormitory villages' as identified on the sites proposed. Any extra houses required should be built on these two sites rather than in Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP13	Mr W Travis		Read with horror at the proposed notion of redeveloping the current Retford Gamston Airport in favour of a new village. This is an ill thought through and ineffective solution despite understanding the need for new housing. The document often uses the word 'sustainable' but very rarely with evidence or reasoning. In this project the word has lost its effect and that the incentives behind it are ill and flaw ridden. No reason to suggest a success of the proposal.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP13	Mr W Travis		States that the airport is an inefficient use of land. This is misinformed. Would like to assume that you are aware of the pilot shortage crisis, with a 2018 estimate telling us that we need as many as 617,000 new pilots by 2035. This is a very real and very serious threat to our modern lives and we cannot afford to make the problem worse. To do so would be a catastrophe. The current site at Gamston is home to several flying schools, each playing a part in the vital role of fundamental training for new pilots. Many of these pilots go onto airlines such as Jet2 and to 'kill off' potential opportunities for new pilots would be a calamitous mistake. There can be no doubt concerning the airport's benefits both locally and to the wider region. Fail to see any actual figures regarding the economic contribution of the airport this suggesting a severe lack of research into the proposal. The Plan states that the closure of the airport will not have a profound effect on jobs, as new ones will be created at the new village. Fail to see figures quoted as to the level or even sector of employment that would supposedly be created. Assume that the majority of jobs created would be from the construction of the new village. This is more evidence of the Council's inability to think about what is best for the long term, as these jobs would only be temporary contracts and after project completion there would actually be a larger level of unemployment. What the Council fails to see is the current contribution of the airport, its ability to create jobs and its ability to exert a positive multiplier effect on the surrounding area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP13	Mr W Travis		Question the actual purpose, use and credibility of the project. The Plan sets out that we need more homes and housing, alongwith the rest of the country. Heavily dispute this, as the need at the moment is for affordable housing, enabling new young families the chance to get onto the increasingly, impossible to reach property ladder. Found that the neighbouring village of Elkesley has an average property value of £201,000 in some parts estimates even being as high as £343,000. When the average house price for Nottinghamshire stands at £178,000 and £155,000 in Yorkshire the Elkesley prices are clearly out of the range of 'affordable' and there is no reason to believe that the proposed village would be different.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP15	Mrs A Godley		Developers should also look at the acres of land Gamston aerodrome occupies - an ideal opportunity for new roads, shops etc to accommodate the houses.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP16	Mr T Bray		Support the proposal for the two new villages so long as not too much farmland is taken over cutting down food crops and livestock requirements.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP18	C Redford		Examined the plans and know the site well. Wish to object strongly to the development of these houses in this location. Very concerned that para 12.8 states that the site 'provides good connectivity with Retford' when the roads are connected between Retford and Gamston Airport are London Road which is already well known to be heavily congested, and Ordsall Road which passes Ordsall Primary School. This cannot be acceptable for the use of up to 10000 cars. How can the roads to the south of Retford sustain traffic from allocation of 30% of the whole of Bassetlaw new housing development requirement? The traffic through Gamston village would also be too heavy for the village to tolerate.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP20	P Launders		Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed. Support a large number of houses being built on these sites as opposed to the numbers being put forward for Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP21	Mr & Mrs B Hopps		Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed. Support a larger number of houses being built on these sites as opposed to the numbers being put forward for Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP22	L Evans		No objection to the new garden village at Bevercotes which is a good use of land and is currently disused.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP22	L Evans		Completely object to the garden village at Retford Gamston Airport. Its absolutely disgusting that airfields are being destroyed to make room for new housing and industrial estates and oppose the development at my local aerodrome. Airfields should not be closed, they are fantastic places which should be protected. Once the airfield is gone its gone forever as there is no plan to replace it. Retford Gamston Airport is one of the best general aviation airfields in the country, and the local skies are always abundant with aircraft which fly from there. The airfield has hangarage for up to 100 aircraft and is home to many successful aviation businesses such as Gamston Flying School, Radiola Aerospace and Diamond Executive Aviation. If the airfield closes where will these aircraft and businesses go? Many airfields are closing across the country to become housing estates so there will not be room at those which remain to base the displaced aircraft. No doubt the plan is to move the aircraft to nearby Doncaster Sheffield Airport - this is unviable. The international airport wants to expand drastically between now and 2037 with enhancement of the terminal and cargo facilities. This will make little room for general aviation aircraft - it is unlikely that the Gamston residents could move there. Moreover Gamston has a 5500ft asphalt runway which is long enough for large business jets to land and take-off. Few general aviation airfields have a runway of this length and it is vital that it is protected. Other airfields in close proximity to Gamston have grass runways which are unacceptable for these types of aircraft. How long are these airfields going to remain before these too are earmarked for housing? General aviation will soon be extinct in the UK if airfields are allowed to be developed. This is a travesty which is why the garden village should be abolished.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP22	L Evans		The plan involves 4000 new homes, 1000 before 2035 and 3000 beyond. This is a huge number of houses - there will be up to 10000 people living in close proximity. This is approx half the population of Retford so the use of local facilities will increase by 50%.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP22	L Evans		Disagree with using land which is currently used as an airport as a new standalone development. Losing airport related employment is bad for the aviation industry. New employment will not be created in the aviation industry which needs fresh talent, instead this is being removed from the locality. Describing Gamston as being 'free from significant constraints' is hardly true when a large number of businesses and airfield uses depend on its provision. Airfields should not be considered brownfield sites they are too important to be easily built on. Gamston is not 'an inefficient use of land' it should be developed further as an airfield to give greater social and economic benefits. Describing the airfield as having 'former aviation significance' is wrong when it is a popular airfield, home to many aircraft and businesses.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP22	L Evans		Due to the size of the development the new village (2500 homes, convenience retail and community facilities, business park, new nursery, primary and secondary schools, health care facilities and recreational space) would not be contained within the current airfield site. It is likely to expand into 'lush green farmland' including huge amounts of farmland surrounding the airfield. Building 2500 dwellings isn't viable and will result in the village spreading into farmland encroaching into fields surrounding Ordsall. Once building starts it will not stop until it coalesces onto South Ordsall, Eaton, Gamston and Elkesley creating one unseparated development. The plan mentions new bridges over the river which sounds like the plan is to expand into neighbouring farmland which is totally barbaric. This will disrupt local wildlife, such as bats and owls. It will also result in houses being built in areas which are likely to flood due to the close proximity of the River Idle.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP22	L Evans		Infrastructure around the airport cannot cope with the current level of traffic - without 5000 more cars, & the vast number of new residents - roads around the site will be unable to cope with the volume of traffic. The B6387 is dangerous with sharp bends and the bend on Rectory Lane junction in Gamston is perilous. This road is incapable of dealing with traffic from 2500 homes and is likely to result in increased accidents. Brick Yard Road and Jockey Lane will be incapable of dealing with the large volume of traffic from the new village. This road is also very bendy especially the sharp one by Gamston runway and is unfit for thousands of cars using it daily. This will be one of the main roads leading to the A1 and the runoff junction leading to Elkesley Bridge is too small. Brick Yard Road will be a major road leading into Retford, the town centre and railway station. Ollerton Road is perilous with people speeding up the hill and out of Ordsall. Pulling out of Lansdown Drive and Gleneagles Way is extremely dangerous and the increased traffic will make this worse. The mini roundabouts in Ordsall and at Whitehouses are unable to deal with traffic and these will be heavily used. Another main road used will be London Road, Retford. This is already too busy due to too many houses being built on the road and it will be unable to deal with the immense number of cars using it. The new village will have easy access to the A1 but this will add to congestion when an accident occurs - the A1 traffic plus that from the village will make Retford roads unmovable. Retford is getting gridlocked especially on Babworth Road and London Road in rush hour. The plan has not been thought through and there has been no consideration to the impact on Retford and surrounding areas.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP22	L Evans		Gamston is far from the East Coast Main Line and Sheffield to Lincoln railway lines. Retford station is in an unsuitable area with Queen Street and Victoria Road far too congested. It will be impossible to get even more cars down to get to the station. There is not enough parking and the train station facilities cannot deal with the increased number of travellers from new development. Bus services are limited and the new village will increase traffic on the A1 which will soon be unable to cope. Retford just cannot deal with the size of the proposed new villages.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP22	L Evans		What about the provision of schools, doctors, hospitals etc? There is a plan for a new secondary school on the site. Where are teachers going to be found and how is the school to be funded? Educational establishments are having their budgets squeezed as there is no money for what they require. Bassetlaw Hospital cannot cope with the number of patients, services are no longer offered and people have to go to Doncaster. These two hospitals will be unable to cope with the vast number of patients. With further housing planned around Doncaster Sheffield Airport the strain on healthcare will increase. Waiting times for doctors are obscene this will get worse with increased residents. The constituency cannot cope with the size of the new village.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP22	L Evans		Gamston Airport have 11 recently built hangars capable of housing up to 100 aircraft. In 2015 Gamston was voted best general aviation airport of the year, and the airport has 15,000 aircraft movements a year. The airport is centrally located in Bassetlaw and is easily accessible to Nottinghamshire, South Yorkshire and Lincolnshire. If the airport is removed there will no longer be an airport in close proximity. The Apron Cafe gets fantastic reviews and the airport can deal with aircraft up to a gross weight of 25,000kg. This is something smaller, grass runways are unable to provide.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP22	L Evans		There are multiple aviation businesses on site which will be affected by the closure of the airport. Gamston Flying School is a brilliant flight training school and without this being based locally people will no longer be able to learn to fly. Gaining a PPL is often the first step to gain a commercial pilots licence and as there is a need for new pilots losing a flight school will add to the problem. Having a local airport encourages people like me to go into aviation related careers - without the airfield young people will not be able to find out about the various aviation careers available. There is a massive STEM skills gap and the airport is vital to keeping local people interested in aviation. Radiola Aerospace is a hugely successful company and according to their website are leaders in flight inspection, navigation and communication systems. Their regional office is at Gamston and they work with Diamond Executive Aviation at Gamston. Closing Gamston will have a detrimental impact on them and finding a new airfield to operate from will be difficult. Visit Gamston Airport, witness the airfield in operation and see why this fantastic place needs preserving for generations.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP23	Mrs A Pacey		The proposal for 2 new garden villages is an excellent idea, provided they are affordable and all amenities are supplied, therefore saving travelling and global warming.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP24	F Ieromino		Does not support the proposal for the two new villages	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP25	M Evans		The proposed village on the current Gamston Airport site will increase the amount of traffic coming into Retford to shop. With the close proximity of the new development with Retford, residents will use facilities like large supermarkets for greater choice rather than use the convenience store on site as mentioned in the plans. The roads are already extremely busy, especially when a crash occurs on the A1 which happens more frequently. Don't think the road network will cope with the large increase in traffic from the number of houses destined to be built.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP25	M Evans		Gamston Airport is required in the area as many airfields have closed in recent years to become housing estates and this should not happen to an award winning airfield. Where will aircraft be housed when the airport is closed and what about the many successful aviation businesses that are based on site, what happens to them?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP25	M Evans		Where are all the occupants of the new villages going to find work in the area? If they are going to travel by car to their place of work, the road network will not be able to cope with the sudden increase in traffic during rush hour, which during these times are already struggling with the volume of vehicles using them. If travelling by train the roads surrounding the station are inadequate at busy times of the day to access and park even just to drop off at the station to catch a train is difficult.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP25	M Evans		Only assume it will be a matter of time that the new village will coalesce onto the edge of town to make one unseparated settlement. Unsure how all that is mentioned will fit into the boundary of the site when it includes new schools, parks, allotments, healthcare facilities, sports pitches and employment land.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP27	Mrs R Owen		Support the creation of two new villages at Gamston and Bevercoates are a very good idea, they will both have easy access to the A1, therefore taking a little of the traffic away from the roads in Ordsall and Retford. Both Ordsall and Retford could not take many more houses and the traffic is already built up on nearly all the roads at certain times of the day.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP28	Mr S Owen		Really like the idea of creating two new villages at Gamston and Bevercoates, they will both have easy access to the A1, which in turn will take traffic away from Ordsall and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP29	S Machin		Not averse to the idea of the Garden Villages but there needs to be a major upgrade in the road systems to accommodate the increase in traffic. It was suggested there might be a new road linking the Gamston site with the A638. Traffic should be discouraged from going through Eaton which is a small hamlet with a narrow road that is not suitable for large increases in traffic.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP29	S Machin		Be happy to see the site developed because there is nuisance caused by low flying aircraft that make no effort to avoid overflying the houses at the lower end of the village even though they are not in a direct line into the runway.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP30	R Evans		As a resident of Ordsall living just a mile from the proposed developments at Gamston Airfield oppose the plans in the Draft Plan. Should the plans come to fruition it would mean a further 4000 new homes within approximately four miles of my address. This is a significant number of new homes and will impose a significant pressure on the local infrastructure which from experience is already struggling with the level of demand placed upon it.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP30	R Evans		The traffic this scheme will generate is a concern as the estate I live on requires me to pull out onto the busy Ollerton Road at its junction with Lansdown Drive. This junction is dangerous at times owing to drivers entering and leaving Ordsall showing no regard for the 30mph speed limit. The visibility from the junction towards Ordsall is less than ideal and is worsened by the fact that the road into Ordsall is on a hill. Combined with the excessive speed at which some motorists drive, this junction is already dangerous. Many of the new residents will use Ollerton Road as a way of getting into Retford - there is currently a crash gate on the sharp bend at Brick Yard Road which could be an access point for the development. With 2500 homes planned at Gamston, it is feasible that in excess of 5000 cars could be parked there, and each of these could pass the junction which I pass to commute, increasing the risks to myself, other drivers on my estate and pedestrians in the area. Retford is becoming increasingly congested. I queue in traffic more than previously as I commute along North Road. Fortunate that can start work at 8am so I avoid the worst traffic during the school run which sees traffic queueing from Hallcroft roundabout up to Retford Oaks. Similarly at 5pm the queue can sometimes stretch to the mini roundabout on Babworth Road. A large number of potential commuters into Retford has the potential to cause greater congestion. Some will commute to Newark/Doncaster but the accidents on the A1 resulting in road closures and traffic diverting through Retford cause more congestion making this undesirable to many. Many residents would prefer to work in Retford because of its close proximity to the new developments which would reduce the journey time to work but result in an intolerable level of congestion in the area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP30	R Evans		Concerns for other services. Often have to wait a month or more for a doctor's appointment unless it is an emergency. Will the new residents have their own doctors or will they attend the existing ones in Retford, resulting in longer waiting times than the already unacceptably long waiting times that exist? Will new supermarkets be built or will new residents shop at those in Retford despite parking can be challenging at busy times, similarly parking in the town centre on a Saturday. Aware that new schools are planned but has the effect on the existing schools been studied. Some of the local schools are not in the best position with staff being made redundant owing to schools having lower numbers that they were designed for and the Post 16 Centre has closed owing to under performance. New schools could hinder the schools in Retford if they provide better facilities than those that exist. Those could leave schools such as Retford Oaks (built only 12 years ago) struggling for staff/students, rendered unviable and at a risk of closure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP30	R Evans		Concerned by the potential closure of Gamston Airport. It is home to a number of businesses providing services to the aviation industry and to the local community. For those learning to fly, Gamston Flying School allows someone to take control of an aircraft and gain a pilot's licence. Many commercial pilots would have started their careers by gaining a licence at schools like this. Kuki Helicopters provides a similar service for those who wish to fly helicopters. DEA aviation are a full service provider of bespoke airborne sensing solutions including intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, aerial survey and flight calibration. Radiola Aerospace specialise in aeronautical navigation aids, flight inspection and flight navigation and provide services to military and civil aviation customers. In addition to the business the airport has 11 hangars and is home to 100 aircraft ranging from a small 2 seat Cessna training aircraft to private jets. Excluding military and commercial airfields such as RAF Waddington and Doncaster Sheffield all nearby airfields such as Netherthorpe have short runways and these are mostly grass. While this is acceptable for small aircraft it precludes using such airports for larger private jets. The weather is likely to cause operational issues for grass runways. Gamston has 5522 feet long asphalt runway with lighting, larger and heavier jets are able to operate in wet weather and at night. The Children's Air Ambulance is also based there showing the airfield's capabilities and usefulness to the industry.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP30	R Evans		The Apron Café at the airfield is regarded highly by visitors and is a destination for those who have no connection to aviation due to its high quality food. Many people from Retford and the surrounding villages would be disappointed if it was to close to allow more houses to be built, particularly given the number of houses that have already been built in the area and the disruption construction has caused such as the former Retford Leisure Centre car park and the present development at Norman's Garden Centre, London Road.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP30	R Evans		Aviation can have an impact on young people. My sister has been inspired by Vulcan XH558 and the Red Arrows which are based locally and has had a trial flying lesson at Gamston. This has resulted in her wanting to learn to fly and gain a PPL in the future. Aviation is now her passion and she is studying Aerospace Engineering at University with a dream to design aircraft. The closure of many airfields across the country and turned into housing will have a detrimental impact on the aviation industry as a result of reduction in flight training capacity and a lack of inspiration. There is a STEM skills shortage and airfields should be allowed to flourish and inspire the next generation.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		This proposal could increase the population in my divisional area from 10000 to 20000+ more than doubling the population of a scenic and pleasant rural area. The proposal could increase the population of East Markham ward from over 2000 to 12000+ over a number of years more than a six fold increase. The populations also face the 20% increase in the draft plan. Object strongly to the draft plan. Jobs and employment should be a priority in this document. Safety on the roads for the rural population should be prioritised over the residential expansion proposed. Public transport, in this case rail should be made more use of, and increased residential in West Bassetlaw for access to Sheffield and the North by existing rail links. Commercial and industrial situated next to the A1 (garden village sites) to avoid residential.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		The concerns of constituents are not nimbism. A non transparent process of selecting the Garden Villages intends to dump extra houses in this area only. Need to know what sites were considered and why these were selected, when the public transport for job opportunities is better for instance at Shireoaks with a short rail journey to the northern towns and cities.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		Bassetlaw reduced it's investment in rural areas with the drastic reduction in the concurrent grant. This grant was designed to compensate the parishes for services provided by BDC to the towns of Retford and Worksop. The New Town proposal on Bevercotes and the Gamston Airfield is not rural investment, but a stand alone new Town which will do nothing for rural investment or the existing rural communities around and about the area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		Compact residential planning is desirable, coalescence may be acceptable or even desirable where fragmentation of the rural area and existing country would be the result. The proposal is a modern form of ribbon development which planning was designed to prevent after the second world war. Residential sprawl was considered undesirable as opposed to extension of compact communities with nearby accessible services.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		What are the other sites? The draft gives the impression of a fait accompli even though it is supposed to be a consultation. Why are we not allowed to see the other areas considered and the reasons they were rejected? BDC has not taken forward these sites either efficiently or with sufficient consultation with other public bodies. When I enquired at NCC, I was told that BDC had not put forward sufficient information for NCC to comment on so they could not support this draft proposal. This proposal is not supportable as part of a long term growth plan. Commercial and industrial, putting jobs as the priority on these sites, with the direct access onto the A1, without having to pass any residential is the correct use of these sites, putting residential in the towns where the present services can provide without isolation.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		Connectivity to the East Coast Main line and the Lincoln Worksop Sheffield line will be poor. There is insufficient parking to support increased commuting from outside Retford. There is little opportunity to expand parking capacity. Walking and Cycling to the train station by residents in the town is necessary. A new commercial pay car park was installed West of the main line to allow increased access that side of town to the station from the under rail tunnel. The requirements were increased lighting and improvement of approaching footpaths to make this attractive. Despite support from Retford Councillors none of the required improvements were forthcoming, and the commercial car park was closed. This was an opportunity lost. The connectivity to the A1 is better exploited by the industrial and commercial traffic which will not have to pass through residential areas to access the rest of the country. That heavy traffic is the most damaging and polluting.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		There are currently over a hundred jobs at Gamston airport. The area must not lose these if possible as the Cottam Power station closes now with the loss of 300 jobs. West Burton Power station to close shortly.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		The settlement is not sustainable in the community sense. Residential sprawl has its own character but not necessarily a community especially in commuting ghost towns. There are no guarantees how this will turn out despite high ambitions. Talk of health facilities, schools, playing fields and benefits are much exaggerated, and BDC have never made efforts for the existing garden villages. Most of the sports clubs for instance are completely funded with private money, although grants are obtained for all sources where possible. The build benefit is likely to benefit a developer and staff from out of the area anyway. This real sense of community is aspirational. BDC will have no control over the sense of community which is likely to be isolated from the existing country communities.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		Garden villages is a term of presentation of an unpalatable proposal. Employment opportunities are limited. This is not an environmentally friendly proposal as most of the residents are going to have to commute miles and to the cities to obtain the most sustainable jobs. It would be better to build houses at and in Retford on Retford's economic development land and move Retford's economic development to Bevercotes and the airfield. This will allow the increased Retford residential population to cycle or walk into Retford or use the regular bus services. This will give them easier access to the train station. The movement of the commercial industrial to the garden villages will mean the Retford commercial/industrial light industrial traffic will not have to pass through Retford residential areas or through any residential areas to access the main road network. Workers from away will also not pass through Retford residential. Agricultural Value: Gamston Airfield is a valuable agricultural resource. The plan proposes to convert this land into leisure use and tree planting. The quality of the land is suitable for a wide range of crops. The National Potato demonstration was held on this site for many years. Harvesting, planting, working demonstrations, because of the suitability of the soil which is highly productive and versatile. Only half the temperate food needs are grown in this country. BDC has not mentioned this land as an important resource to grow food.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		It is not possible to retain a rural nature with 4000 houses. A New town urban extension is a better description.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		ALTERNATIVE SUGGESTION: The Sheffield City Region is better accessed by increased development at Shireoaks. The existing station provides major opportunities to access jobs further West of Worksop by rail in the enlarged urban extensions of Anston, Dinnington, Sheffield and the northern cities including Doncaster. The New road planned towards Sandy Lane roundabout from Todwick will provide unrivalled opportunities, with superb access to the M1 motorway and corridor.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		Attempting to provide new and enhanced services and facilities for surrounding areas and new communities. -BDC has been very limited in what services it has provided to the surrounding rural areas. Waste collection yes. What else? Are these new town settlers something special that they are going to receive enhanced services when the residents of East Bassetlaw have been paying high council tax for little for years? *Connectivity and accessibility to Retford and Tuxford is likely to be overwhelmed. Access to Retford is already difficult, especially from the South. *Tuxford centre is congested and difficult to access at busy times. The proposed new town sites are not convenient from Retford station and frankly too far away. * Economic prosperity will be promoted by retaining these sites as commercial and industrial providing jobs for Bassetlaw. *It is not within BDC remit to provide schools provision. Schools are authorised when existing demand proves the need for investment and this is assessed at NCC. This is a non political process which only becomes an obligation with certain criteria. In the meantime the pressure would be on existing stretched facilities.*Its impossible to deliver a Net diversity gain with ecological enhancement by building houses. Mitigation cannot replace the Net negatives of urbanisation.* The highway improvements that could be delivered would benefit commercial and industrial development more than residential development.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		EAST BASSETLAW Under the present proposals Retford is favoured by not getting it's appropriate share of residential development. Development in Retford is sustainable with existing health facilities and it makes sense to locate older people to Retford where the can get appropriate and timely healthcare support. Development should still be focussed on Retford as the centre and NOT the rural villages.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		This is sensible, but most of the population of these settlements will commute elsewhere to work. These developments are likely to be ghost towns during the day with people enjoying their leisure elsewhere as well, so may become dormitories for the cities. Evidence is easily obtained as the new estates in Worksop are mostly deserted during the day.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		BDC has no power over these services and infrastructure, on present form they are unlikely to influence NCC or other services. The A1 is dual and already over congested. When I travel North from Newark in the evening a 50 mph speed is dictated by the density of the traffic. This proposal with the high number of residential car journeys will increase the congestion on this part of the road.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		On the figures provided in the 2018-2035 period there is unlikely to be a legitimate requirement for even 1 primary school. This makes me suspicious that once the proposed land is incorporated into the Draft Plan there is a plot to proceed faster than that laid out. The number of houses estimated in the short term for the New Town is identical to the village of East Markham, which has a small school. This school has been at capacity for some time but it has been difficult to obtain a new school Hall which was desperately needed. Funding has only recently been obtained from the government facilitated by NCC. Delivery is years behind requirement. CONCLUSION Schools provision is likely not to be delivered until after 2035 on provision criteria, depending how the town would grow.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		This is likely to be a similar community unfulfilled requirement as most other rural villages, as in the short term it is no bigger than East Markham, which does not even have a village shop. This urban extension area is likely to be a dormitory commuter area derelict of community. The development is likely to resemble a graveyard with lights.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		Sa Nursery and Primary education are unlikely before 2035 and nurseries are privately provided. b Only if private. c Health Centres - These are not going to be provided here in the short term, and health provision is going to be accessed at existing facilities in Tuxford and Retford. 5c This comes as supplying too little information. Health facilities in Retford are already short of staff. Radiology in Retford only operates 2 days a week because of shortage of staff. Patients have to travel to Worksop. Staff prefer to work in the larger hospitals. Bassetlaw hospital in Worksop has difficulty in recruiting staff. It is one of the smallest hospitals in the country. Modern health workers like to be where the specialisation is, in the larger hospitals. The proposed garden villages and village growth is likely to be older people according to this paper. It is not a good idea to put these people in Eastern and Northern Bassetlaw , a long way from main health provision and hospitals. Any additional residential development requiring car journeys outside Retford and parking as a result is going to increase the difficult access to Retford and its station. New Roads will not help with this and are unlikely to be provided as they would be ineffective.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		All the provisions suggested are supplied privately in the Parishes and rural areas. Private clubs , charities and the parishes fund these. BDC does not financially support this provision in the rural areas, so this is presumed to be a wish list. Infrastructure planning gain will not will not pay for this wish list. The residents would wish to see all these benefits and services but are used to receiving little apart from refuse collection and Council Tax bills from BDC. The rural residents are going to be resentful that BDC considers that the New Town Johnny come latelies, should be treated like VIPs and have a superior status in the services that Bassetlaw wishes to provide for these incomers when BDC does little for them.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		High quality communications technology is required. Many telephone lines exchanges and local boxes are in poor condition and poorly maintained. Aluminium not copper makes up a good part of the network. The rural resident will settle for fibre to the premise at the moment but they do not have access to the luxury fibre optic service which the towns receive. It may be aspirational for the luxury infrastructure to these new Towns, but BDC cannot influence the telecom companies. Need adequate infrastructure to the rural areas, which many rural subscribers have not been getting.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		Residential urban Extension (garden villages) results in a net loss in biodiversity. For instance the open land surrounding the airfield runways is favoured by hares, skylarks, corn buntings and grey partridges, Buzzards and hawks. The airfield prevents a lot of human disturbance. People are apt to wander which creates disturbance to the species, which can be as damaging as killing them outright in the first instance. The urban edge of the urban extensions will increase disturbance round it. The River Maun runs alongside the Colliery site. This is an important habitat for otters and waterfowl which is under threat. The River Idle lakes at Gamston are ecologically and environmentally important. These are likely to be increasingly disturbed rendering these habitats as "sink areas" where the mortality of species is likely to exceed their breeding success. This is why wild species suffer reduced numbers from human disturbance and their pets, and people find this difficult to understand. Some species can accept disturbance such as wood pigeons and rats, but most cannot.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		Does not support 2 new villages	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP34	Revd J Strickland	The River Idle Benefice	Our reply is made from the perspective of spirituality but is not limited to that of a particular or indeed any religion. Concern the wellbeing of the new communities and the continuing wellbeing of the existing communities. Only commenting on the needs of all residents, wre these villages to be built, and not on whether this is the best site for the villages.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP34	Revd J Strickland	The River Idle Benefice	There is much to affirm for these two villages and would want to support the Council in their aspirations to make these developments high quality examples of new communities. Welcome the provision of health facilities - these are lacking in the present villages and residents need to make long journeys to access health care.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP34	Revd J Strickland	The River Idle Benefice	You correctly identify the importance of transport links and the need to substantially improve the existing road network - particularly a new bridge over the A1. Whilst the aspiration is for the villages to be self contained without radical change many people will still travel to work probably by car and travel also to shop.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP34	Revd J Strickland	The River Idle Benefice	Your propose two new primary schools and a secondary school. Ask that an integrated approach is adopted considering also the existing schools in Ellesley and Gamston, which are part of the character of the villages. Is expansion of both or either a possibility? The aim should be that these new villages also enhance the life of the existing residents.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP34	Revd J Strickland	The River Idle Benefice	The plan mentions a village hub for each community but does not mention the provision of a community hall. Our experience of a number of villages is that a community hall significantly enhances the wellbeing of all residents offering a space for many clubs and activities. Such halls once built, can be self sustaining.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP34	Revd J Strickland	The River Idle Benefice	Ask that you consider spirituality. Suggest good provision for physical wellbeing, some provision for mental wellbeing but nothing about spiritual wellbeing. Our desire is that people should have the opportunity to be refreshed spiritually to celebrate life events and acknowledge that there is more to life than the purely physical. To provide the possibility of this suggest that anew primary school be a Church of England academy. This should also be designed to allow a space for worship and community use out of school hours. Alternatively some of the community provision could be offered to the church.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP36	J Trotter		There is alot of industry established at or around the airfield which could not easily be relocated, the airport for one would struggle to get a new licence and would ultimately end in job losses.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP36	J Trotter		The impact so many houses would have on Gamston village would be devastating to go from 100 houses to over 1000 with the dangerous link road between them is an accident hotspot waiting to happen. This year there has been three road traffic accidents on the B6387 as it travels through Gamston with cars being pulled out of the river. This section of the road would be impossible to change without massive impact on the river and the village and would inevitably be the main route to Retford as it is the most direct route. Without a clear highways plan the idea should be rejected. The development of Retford's businesses was highlighted as a goal and for choosing these locations. If this many houses feed Retford then the whole infrastructure needs to be changed as each road that goes to Retford is dangerous and overused - all have been rduced to 50mph to reduce accidents. Retford is gridlocked at rush hour and school run time add to this load would make Retford less attractive to commute and if the main line train allows people to commute further afield parking and access to the station is an issue. Retford does not have the parking or amenities to deal with an increase of this level.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP36	J Trotter		The sites in principle do have a lot to offer and do not object to the development in a sympathetic manner but to make financial sense to the developer and the Council the scale is such that the impact would be catastrophic for the locals and the environment - it is that impact I object to	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for

DBLP38	Lawrence Dudley	Parallax	Concerned about any kind of development that threatens to close Gamston Airport. There's a lot of land nearby that while not brownfield is perfectly suitable for the building of homes that won't close one of the UK's most celebrated general aviation airports. Yes, building homes on the site will create some jobs for a year or two while they are under construction but it will destroy the livelihoods of those who work on the airfield and bury businesses such as DEA and The Apron under a pile of rubble. This plan needs a rethink.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP39	Keith Byatt		Object to the aspect of the plan which shows a garden village planned for Gamston / Retford Airfield. The loss of the airfield would be greatly missed in the flying community of the whole country. It would also result in the loss of two navigation aids, - the NDB and the VOR, both of which I use and would like to continue to use. Also the runway is of a very good length and width, making it idea for larger GA aircraft to use. The flight training facilities provided are also first class with both fixed wing and rotary wing schools established on site. As most of Europe is suffering from a lack of commercial pilots, these flying schools are vital to increase the number. The landing charges to use the airport are quite reasonable considering the facilities in place. To destroy this airport would also be contrary to the Governments policy of encouraging General Aviation. Please reconsider this plan, and find a different site for the village.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP40	James Booth		Gamston Airport is considered to be a thriving example of general aviation in this country. Need GA for a multitude of things; employment; engineers, airfield ops, pilots, operations, stores, accounts, sales etc. The airport is a diverse employer and as this country looks to inspire future generations of air and space minded individuals it plays an important part. People travel from all over the UK to the airport. GA is also an important part of the leisure industry in this country. Gamston airport also makes a sizeable contribution to the GDP through it's higher cost services and the higher wage employment is very much welcome in the local area. Whilst there may well be short term jobs created by the construction of a new village there will be few long term jobs and some of the demand for housing would have come from those people now out of work because of the closure of Gamston Airport. The few jobs in the new village will be limited to low paid unspecialised ones such as those working in the village shop or perhaps, at best, a childcare nursery. Concerned the council is more focused on council tax receipts than diversity in the community. Propose an alternative and interesting venture; invest in Gamston as an 'air and space' hub. Look at constructing houses for aviation minded individuals on the western side of the airfield with their own taxi ways and aircraft hangars/parking; you could even just sell off the plots for self builds; in any event these houses will likely generate you good revenue; they'd all likely be bands D-H. Basically, create a fly-in air park for people to live at. They won't complain about the aviation noise and probably won't fly that often anyhow. The good road links that Gamston has will attract people from further afield. In any event, please do not turn another one of this country's valued airfields into another housing estate.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP41	Mr N Bee		Deeply concerned over plans for Gamston Airport. Am a Bassetlaw Resident, a private pilot and also an aviation employee (based at Heathrow). Closing a commercial entity such as Gamston means people such as myself have to continue to travel great distances to seek employment in this sector rather than be encouraged to be employed locally with local businesses. Closing this airfield discourages aerospace investment in the north of England and with so many alternatives available for development such as the Bevercotes site, development of Thoresby Pit and Harworth Pit where no gainful employment is now made means the removal of an asset unnecessarily in our area. There are numerous now dormant industrial facilities locally (including many near Retford town centre) that should be focused on before seeking the removal of functioning organisations from our area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP42	Mr R Campbell		Appalled at the proposals to develop Gamston airfield as garden village. This airfield is an important part of the UK airfield network and has many successful businesses running on its site. It is an important airfield for flying training and a place for visiting aircraft to land. Have landed there several times in order to visit local attractions. There are also many privately owned aircraft based there and these would have difficulty in re-locating. Do not go ahead with these ill considered plans.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP43	Mr L Alderson		Strongly object to the proposed redevelopment of Retford Gamston Airport as it is a vital part of aviation infrastructure. The site provides outstanding facilities to businesses and private individuals involved in both Commercial and General Aviation which bring a great deal of visitors, business and tourism to the local area. Although not from the area, have visited the airport many times for aviation training, investing into local businesses. Understand that from a certain view point the site may not be the most efficient use of land when compared to housing, it is not a fair comparison. Airports and airfields by virtue require a big area for runways and facilities to operate safely. Airfields and airports have been unfairly targeted since the reclassification of them as brownfield sites as easy targets for quick profit generation. This will continue to challenge the aviation community and industry.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP44	G Burnett		Yet another land snatch promulgated by a council whose plan is specious, poorly drafted and once again attempts to sneak a 'garden village's onto an airfield. Airfields may technically be brownfield sites, but that was an oversight in poorly drafted legislation. Gamston should be regarded as a key part of the green belt, and any attempt to develop it is once again developing land to build houses at the cost of the livelihood of the people who work there. Who gains? Builders and property developers. Who loses? Anyone who is employed there currently and/or supplies goods and services to and from the local community. Once it's gone, it's gone. General and commercial aviation loses once again, and the national stock of training airfields is destroyed by a thousand cuts. Where do the businesses that are currently there go to? It's an 'inefficient use of land' is it? Property developers love airfields, as they are cheap to develop unlike brownfield sites, which cut into their profits. They also like licksplitt district councils; you're seen as easy meat. Shame on you Bassetlaw.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP45	J Jackson		How did you come to the conclusion that Gamston Airport is an 'inefficient' use of space? As someone who uses the airfield regularly - I would disagree. As would, all the businesses and other frequent flyers that use it. It is a unique airfield, one which the county should be proud to be the home of. It shouldn't be a bargaining tool to get a quick 'buck' from a developer. Considering it has been functioning for at least 75 years, it is a bit of a success story.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP46	J Farquhar		Object to the Basset Law Plan and specifically to the closure of Gamston Airport in order to build a new village. Airfields provide a valuable amenity to the community and to local businesses. Gamston Airport is thriving with a significant number of aircraft movements each year and many businesses and associated jobs being based there, most of them dependent on there being an airfield there so impossible to move elsewhere. The success of Gamston is evidenced by the recent completion of the new hangars. This is a major investment and shows the ongoing success and growth of the businesses based there. Airfields should never have been categorised as Brownfield sites - do not believe this was the original intention of the legislation - it crept in almost by accident and is now being exploited by councils and developers with no consideration for the impact on the community and to local wildlife. An airfield also encourages visitors from elsewhere (used it myself several times), thereby bringing in additional business and is also a clear foundation for the aviation industry throughout the country. It is increasingly being recognised that airfields need to be protected and many councils are taking steps to reflect this in their local plans. Hopefully Basinglaw will follow suit and reject this proposal for the new village on the site. Once an airfield has been removed it is almost impossible to establish a replacement so deciding to close Gamston would be a huge mistake to make. Strongly object to the suggestion that Gamston Airport be closed and hope that you will reject this plan at an early stage.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP47	S Barras		Raise my objection to your plans for housing being built on Gamston Airfield. The land is not 'redundant' brownfield first and foremost, therefore not suitable for a housing project. Additionally, Gamston is an important field for strategically connected airfields (they will be able to advise further during consultations). There is plenty of land, airfields do not need to be targeted.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more
DBLP48	J Webb	Webb Aviation	Object to the planning proposal to build houses Retford (Gamston) Airport. The airport is essential infrastructure and this scheme will destroy jobs not just locally but all the intertwined jobs nationwide. Am an aerial photographer and although do not live near Gamston, depend on it and other similar small airfields in order to charter and refuel aircraft. If all the small airfields are built on will be out of a job. Mine is one of a vast number of jobs which are dependent to various degrees on Gamston airport. Similarly there are tens of thousands of people who work in General Aviation including service agents, parts suppliers, engineers etc. If Gamston closes, many local pilots will give up flying and this will have a knock on effect on incomes for businesses the length and breadth of the land.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP49	R McLaughlin		Further to your plan regarding a green village on this site I am as a GA pilot who flies regularly into Gamston lodging an objection. The area is not brownfield as you state as it is not redundant. This is a working airfield. Your plans and statement contradicts para 104f of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework). There are numerous businesses that operate from this airfield including the recent addition of the Children's Air Ambulance. Your planning proposals for the airfield are totally unwarranted and do not reflect existing policy as stated above.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP50	C Sunter	Twismo Financial Planning Ltd	Express dismay that you are considering Retford/ Gamston Airfield as a site for housing and wish to object these plans based on the value this airfield has in view of its location, licences and capacity. Hope you change your mind and do not pursue these housing plans.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP35	M Barden	Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council	The development of the Bevercotes Colliery is welcomed and believed with tasteful planning could create a particularly attractive development. Unsure why there would be any need to remove the option of an airfield used by local businesses; it could only be seen as a negative impact upon the economy. It was felt in this world of the global economy to remove a service that meets the needs of the wider business community would be a retrograde step and is not supported by the parishes.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP52	G Beavis		Object strongly to Gamston: am a retired airline captain who, over the last fourteen years, have done a considerable business at this airport as a private aircraft owner as could get specialist technical support no further south than Gamston; ease of communication via the East Coast Main Line to Retford and a short taxi trip from the station very important. (It's important for a non-flying person to understand that when an aircraft operator delivers an aircraft for servicing or for flyable defect rectification, that the aircraft is left at the maintenance organisation's premises for days or weeks, and the pilot invariably leaves by taxi to the station unless live locally; with a balancing trip in reverse). Over the last fourteen years, have used the airport many times - have supported Diamond Aircraft UK Ltd., and then DEA Aviation at Gamston (and no other UK company) to well over £75,000. Much of this has been filtering into your local economy, from being charged a high hourly labour charge (the staff have highly-trained skills) in the continued employment of engineers, mechanics, administration and record-keeping staff; their subsequent local spending, council taxes and business rates of a high-value company based on the airport. Am a single customer; there are many others. Gamston brings more money into your local economy than you have given it credit for. During trips to Gamston used Retford Station many times, as well as taxi rides, hotel, restaurants and other businesses in Retford. Not unique in bringing this "Spend" into your local economy, as DEA has other customers like myself. Airports need land space, and that extends to the approach and climb-out paths for safety reasons; close an airport for houses means that businesses with international or South-of-England bases won't look at your District for a potential relocation. If you take away the means of visiting, a business will not give your area a second glance. In France towns keep their airfields open with the active support and financial backing of their Chamber of Commerce, as an enabling tool. Whilst a couple of hundred houses will bring income from Planning Application fees, and domestic rates, it also incurs the costs of supporting that increase in population: new roads, increased wear, tear and congestion; street lighting, traffic lights and their running costs; refuse collection; policing, education (you'd need at least one primary school), doctor's surgery (perhaps), so the net gain to the Council would be marginal. Build housing on an active airport's site and close it will not gain great financial improvement; the real profiteers will be developers, who'll keep their profits secret, and sink away with their prize like a marauding fox, and move on to their next meal elsewhere. When a local authority is thinking about closing an airport and building housing on the land, this is a FAILURE to make the best opportunities of their best asset to attract investment - should consider industrial or commercial units on the north side of the airport. Building houses is not the best use; it is the easy way out. Sherburn-in-Elmet, Yorkshire - an enormous distribution centre for Sainsbury's alongside the northwest airfield boundary; - Cumbernauld between Edinburgh and Glasgow, and commercial development is very close. Have the advantage of an airport close to the A1, within 15 minutes of the East Coast Main Line; this is very favourable and appeals to business and commerce, it would be wrong to fail to promote your area to attract business (and then jobs, and thus income for the District), using your airport at its prime appeal for the business owner to relocate.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP53	G Allen		Strongly object to the proposal for a new village for construction up to 2500 dwellings on the site of Retford (Gamston) Airfield. Whilst the requirement for new housing across the district is acknowledged, the appropriate location of suitable sites is paramount and must take into account all local circumstances, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 10 refers. Gamston airfield is definitely not an appropriate site for a new village. Furthermore, it beggars belief that the council states 'the present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land'. Indeed, Gamston is undoubtedly one of the best and most efficiently operated GA airfields in the UK. The proposal for the new village encompasses two quite separate areas of land which are under different ownership. It is much regretted both owners are clearly complicit to sell the land and thus close the airfield. The current developed part of the site, comprising the main runway, hangars, operations centre, cafe and associated business premises, cannot possibly be consider 'brown field land'. All the buildings are modern, well designed and built to a high specification. Subsequent demolition and the loss of all the jobs on the airfield would be an act of economic suicide if this proposal was to be adopted by the Council, contrary to NPPF para 28. Some 9700 jobs are supported by GA flying activity in the UK measured at aerodrome level, including those at Gamston, Department of Transport – GA Strategy refers. Moreover, GA business in the UK supports 38,000 jobs overall and represents some 0.12% of GDP. Furthermore, the northern part of old RAF airfield is currently in productive agricultural use. Recommend the deletion of Gamston Airfield as a site for a new village from the Strategic Plan. The closure of Gamston Airfield, if the proposal for a 'Garden Village' is carried through to the next stage of the Draft Local Plan, is contrary the recently revised NPPF Section 9, sub para 104f. Indeed, the importance 'of maintaining a national network of General Aviation airfields' is recognised in this paragraph and further justifies my strong objections to the current proposal.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP54	D Gibson	POM Flight Training, Humberside International Airport	Object to the proposal for a new village for construction up to 2500 dwellings on the site of Retford (Gamston) Airfield. Whilst the requirement for new housing across the district is acknowledged, the appropriate location of suitable sites is paramount and must take into account all local circumstances, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 10 refers. Gamston airfield is definitely not an appropriate site for a new village. Cannot accept that that, as the council states, 'the present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land'. Indeed, Gamston is undoubtedly one of the best and most efficiently operated General Aviation airfields in the UK. Object for the following reasons: 1. The current developed part of the site, comprising the main runway, hangars, operations centre, cafe and associated business premises, cannot possibly be considered to be 'inefficient'. All the buildings are modern, well designed and built to a high specification. Gamston airfield employs some 250 to 300 people in a variety of roles. Must also take into account that the airfield is used not only by aircraft based at Gamston, but those from other parts of the country who use the facilities for pilot training. There are also executive and business flights which arrive from all over Europe. 2. Pilot shortages have been recognised and recently highlighted as a current and growing issue in the UK. Gamston is a nationally important provider of commercial pilot fixed wing and helicopter training. It is also used by UK and European based flying schools for navigation and procedural training, which would be irreplaceable. The major airports are not designed or equipped to deal with the large amounts of training traffic that Gamston currently deals with, and proposes to develop in the future. For further information on the recent elevation of the importance of General Aviation please refer to the Department of Transport – GA Strategy. Suggest that you have not fully considered the impact on local jobs and the effect on pilot training, both private AND commercial, not to mention the loss of a facility for business aviation. Have to realise that the closure of an airfield is not just affecting your Bassettaw, it affects the whole nation AND furthermore, when an airfield is gone, it is gone forever and will never be replaced.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP58	S Rennie		Totally opposed to your destruction of the airport. Flown in there regularly for some 35 years and its one of the best GA airfields in existence and if the Council had any proper knowledge or understanding of aviation it would be blindly obvious what a most wonderful asset they have in their locality. A crass idea beyond belief.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP59	G Holland	Styrrup with Oldcotes Parish Council	The concept of garden villages at Gamston Airport and Bevercotes former Colliery is not supported due to lack of infrastructure and poor amenity and facilities. Both these locations were developed for their previous use BECAUSE they were rural and out of the way, exactly the reason that they are not supported for housing.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for
DBLP60	S Lilley	Nottinghamshire Fire &	Will the new villages have alternative energy supplies?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence
DBLP60	S Lilley	Nottinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service	Although in the hierarchy of transport users throughout the plan refers to emergency services, are you aware of the size of modern fire appliances to be considered when planning?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP60	S Lilley	Nottinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service	Will there be any development to rural roads to cope with increased traffic?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP61	J Mann MP	Parliamentary Candidate for Bassetlaw	Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed and support a larger number of houses being built on these sites as opposed to the numbers being put forward for Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP62	S Dalglish & C Jubb		A good solution to reduce impacts on Retford would be the planned build of two new villages identified for Gamston Airport and Bevercotes Colliery. These villages would mean the direct pressure on Retford could be elevated whilst still being able to support the growth of Retford and surrounding areas which we fully support, however we feel that this should be done in a way which gives Retford residents piece of mind that our current lifestyles and properties will not be affected by large border expansions. Feel this would be suitable for the council to expand in the future whilst being able to leave the borders as they currently lie. Consideration should be given to ensuring houses built are affordable.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more
DBLP63	A Rose	Netjets	Object to the proposal for a new village for construction up to 2500 dwellings on the site of Retford (Gamston) Airfield. Whilst the requirement for new housing across the district is acknowledged, the appropriate location of suitable sites is paramount and must take into account all local circumstances, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 10 refers. Gamston is definitely not an appropriate site for a new village. Furthermore, I cannot accept that that, as the council states, 'the present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land'. Indeed, Gamston is undoubtedly one of the best and most efficiently operated General Aviation airfields in the UK. Object for the following reasons: 1) The current developed part of the site, comprising the main runway, hangars, operations centre, cafe and associated business premises, cannot possibly be considered to be 'inefficient'. All the buildings are modern, well designed and built to a high specification. Gamston airfield employs some 250 to 300 people in a variety of roles. The airfield is used not only by aircraft based at Gamston, but those from other parts of the country who use the facilities for pilot training. There are also executive and business flights which arrive from all over Europe. 2) Pilot shortages have been recognised and recently highlighted as a current and growing issue in the UK. Gamston is a nationally important provider of commercial pilot fixed wing and helicopter training. It is also used by UK and European based flying schools for navigation and procedural training, which would be irreplaceable. The major airports are not designed or equipped to deal with the large amounts of training traffic that Gamston currently deals with, and proposes to develop in the future. For further information on the recent elevation of the importance of General Aviation please refer to the Department of Transport – GA Strategy. You have not fully considered the impact on local jobs and the effect on pilot training, both private AND commercial, and the loss of a facility for business aviation. The closure of an airfield is not just affecting Bassetlaw, it affects the whole nation AND furthermore, when an airfield is gone, it is gone forever and will never be replaced.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP64	J MacNaught	POM Flight Training, Humberstone International Airport	Object to the proposal for a new village on the site of Retford (Gamston) Airfield. Whilst the requirement for new housing across the district is acknowledged, the appropriate location of suitable sites is paramount and must take into account all local circumstances, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 10 refers. Gamston is definitely not an appropriate site for a new village. Cannot accept that that, as the council states, 'the present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land'. Indeed, Gamston is undoubtedly one of the best and most efficiently operated General Aviation airfields in the UK. Object for the following reasons: 1) The current developed part of the site, comprising the main runway, hangars, operations centre, cafe and associated business premises, cannot possibly be considered to be 'inefficient'. All the buildings are modern, well designed and built to a high specification. Gamston airfield employs some 250 to 300 people in a variety of roles. The airfield is used not only by aircraft based at Gamston, but those from other parts of the country who use the facilities for pilot training. There are also executive and business flights which arrive from all over Europe. 2) Pilot shortages have been recognised and recently highlighted as a current and growing issue in the UK. Gamston is a nationally important provider of commercial pilot fixed wing and helicopter training. It is also used by UK and European based flying schools for navigation and procedural training, which would be irreplaceable. The major airports are not designed or equipped to deal with the large amounts of training traffic that Gamston currently deals with, and proposes to develop in the future. For further information on the recent elevation of the importance of General Aviation please refer to the Department of Transport – GA Strategy. You have not fully considered the impact on local jobs and the effect on pilot training, both private AND commercial or the loss of a facility for business aviation. The closure of an airfield is not just affecting Bassetlaw, it affects the whole nation AND furthermore, when an airfield is gone, it is gone forever and will never be replaced.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP65	Simon Piegalski	POM Flight Club	Object to the new village on the site of Retford (Gamston) Airfield. Whilst the requirement for new housing across the district is acknowledged, the appropriate location of suitable sites is paramount and must take into account all local circumstances, the NPPF para 10 refers. Gamston is not an appropriate site for a new village. Cannot accept that, as the council states, 'the present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land'. Indeed, Gamston is undoubtedly one of the best and most efficiently operated General Aviation airfields in the UK. Object for the following reasons: 1) The current developed part of the site, comprising the main runway, hangars, operations centre, cafe and associated business premises, cannot possibly be considered to be 'inefficient'. All the buildings are modern, well designed and built to a high specification. Gamston airfield employs some 250 to 300 people in a variety of roles. Must take into account that the airfield is used not only by aircraft based at Gamston, but those from other parts of the country who use the facilities for pilot training. There are also executive and business flights which arrive from all over Europe. 2) Pilot shortages have been recognised and recently highlighted as a current and growing issue in the UK. Gamston is a nationally important provider of commercial pilot fixed wing and helicopter training. It is also used by UK and European based flying schools for navigation and procedural training, which would be irreplaceable. The major airports are not designed or equipped to deal with the large amounts of training traffic that Gamston currently deals with, and proposes to develop in the future. For further information on the recent elevation of the importance of General Aviation please refer to the Department of Transport – GA Strategy. Suggest you have not fully considered the impact on local jobs and the effect on pilot training, both private AND commercial, or the loss of a facility for business aviation. The closure of an airfield is not just affecting Bassetlaw, it affects the whole nation AND furthermore, when an airfield is gone, it is gone forever and will never be replaced.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP66	R Wilks	POM Flight Club	Object to the new village on Retford (Gamston) Airfield. Whilst the requirement for new housing across the district is acknowledged, the appropriate location of suitable sites is paramount and must take into account all local circumstances, the NPPF para 10 refers. Gamston is not an appropriate site for a new village. Cannot accept that, as the council states, 'the present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land'. Indeed, Gamston is undoubtedly one of the best and most efficiently operated General Aviation airfields in the UK. Object for the following reasons: 1) The current developed part of the site, comprising the main runway, hangars, operations centre, cafe and associated business premises, cannot possibly be considered to be 'inefficient'. All the buildings are modern, well designed and built to a high specification. Gamston airfield employs some 250 to 300 people in a variety of roles. Must take into account that the airfield is used not only by aircraft based at Gamston, but those from other parts of the country who use the facilities for pilot training. There are also executive and business flights which arrive from all over Europe. 2) Pilot shortages have been recognised and recently highlighted as a current and growing issue in the UK. Gamston is a nationally important provider of commercial pilot fixed wing and helicopter training. It is also used by UK and European based flying schools for navigation and procedural training, which would be irreplaceable. The major airports are not designed or equipped to deal with the large amounts of training traffic that Gamston currently deals with, and proposes to develop in the future. For further information on the recent elevation of the importance of General Aviation please refer to the Department of Transport – GA Strategy. Suggest that you have not fully considered the impact on local jobs and the effect on pilot training, both private AND commercial or the loss of a facility for business aviation. The closure of an airfield is not just affecting Bassetlaw, it affects the whole nation AND furthermore, when an airfield is gone, it is gone forever and will never be replaced.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP67	A Middleton		Support the creation of two new villages at Gamston airfield and Bevercotes former colliery site.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP68	L Sandie		Object to the proposal for a new village for up to 2500 dwellings on the site of Retford (Gamston) Airfield. Whilst the requirement for new housing across the district is acknowledged, the appropriate location of suitable sites is paramount and must take into account all local circumstances, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 10 refers. Gamston is not an appropriate site for a new village. Cannot accept that, as the council states, 'the present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land'. Indeed, Gamston is undoubtedly one of the best and most efficiently operated General Aviation airfields in the UK. Object for the following reasons: 1) The current developed part of the site, comprising the main runway, hangars, operations centre, cafe and associated business premises, cannot possibly be considered to be 'inefficient'. All the buildings are modern, well designed and built to a high specification. Gamston airfield employs some 250 to 300 people in a variety of roles. Must take into account that the airfield is used not only by aircraft based at Gamston, but those from other parts of the country who use the facilities for pilot training. There are also executive and business flights which arrive from all over Europe. 2) Pilot shortages have been recognised and recently highlighted as a current and growing issue in the UK. Gamston is a nationally important provider of commercial pilot fixed wing and helicopter training. It is also used by UK and European based flying schools for navigation and procedural training, which would be irreplaceable. The major airports are not designed or equipped to deal with the large amounts of training traffic that Gamston currently deals with, and proposes to develop in the future. For further information on the recent elevation of the importance of General Aviation please refer to the Department of Transport – GA Strategy. Suggest that you have not fully considered the impact on local jobs and the effect on pilot training, both private AND commercial or the loss of a facility for business aviation. The closure of an airfield is not just affecting Bassetlaw, it affects the whole nation AND furthermore, when an airfield is gone, it is gone forever and will never be replaced.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP69	K Swinglehurst & B Stakes		The creation of the two new urban areas to satisfy the local housing needs seems a very sensible and logical solution and one which we fully support. In fact we believe these areas could indeed accommodate a greater number of dwellings than those being proposed and that doing so would in turn negate the need for the housing being proposed in Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP70	N and E Housego		The creation of the new villages looks very sensible - would suggest that these could be bigger to remove the need for further housing in Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP73	K Lamb		Support the creation of two new villages as identified on the sites proposed, as this would revive what currently is a wasted and misused space in some cases, with restored life and job opportunities. Not only will it provide housing but it will also reassure local residents of Retford that their concerns regarding the expansion of Retford beyond its current boundaries of the town are being heard but more importantly listened to.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP72	F and D Brown		The idea of new villages being built is an excellent idea.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP74	S Beard	Sport England	Active Design will be particularly important in the delivery of two Garden Villages in Bassetlaw. A reference to active design could be added specifically to policy 12.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP75	B Blythe		As an aviator and frequent visitor to Gamston airport and their superb restaurant it is incredulous that it is stated that the present use of the land is inefficient! What a lot of nonsense! It is about time we stopped covering our land with concrete and minimised population growth and this uncontrolled migration instead. Now that would be a better use for councils to try and stem the tide of increased population. We do not need more houses, we need control over the population on this small island. Stop this ridiculous development idea now. Appalled that all the airport staff, clubs, visitors and restaurant staff are dismissed without thought. They don't want to find other jobs they are happy with the ones they have.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP76	S Barlow		Object strongly to the planning application that is being put forward to yourself regarding Gamston Retford Airport to be closed and for a garden village to replace it, as the local villagers are already just coping with the traffic and as the airport brings in many needed jobs and gives locals as well as many people a place to use for pleasure as well as professionals a place to fly in and do business. The surrounding area has many places better suited to village life than on the side of the A1 and would not cause the loss of the only airport in the local area and many jobs	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP77	J Green		Developing a garden village on an active, growing and vibrant GA Aerodrome does not appear to be aligned with government policy or where that policy is heading. NPPF Paragraph 104 f) states that Planning Policy should "recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the government's General Aviation Strategy." Bassetlaw has failed to recognise this in the preparation of the Local Plan with the proposal to allocate Gamston Airport as a Garden Village. The first General Aviation (GA) Strategy, outlines its vision for UK GA and recognises its potential as a wealth generating and job producing sector of the economy. In December 2017, the Secretary of State for Transport Chris Grayling MP appointed Byron Davies as the Government's General Aviation Champion to produce "Aviation 2050, The future of UK aviation, A Consultation". Chapter 7 refers to General Aviation and to accompanying documents: General Aviation Strategic Network Recommendations. Aviation 2050 recognises the UK strategic importance of General Aviation. Government data indicates that the sector is responsible for contributing £1.1bn directly and £0.9bn indirectly to the UK economy and is responsible for employing approximately 10,000 people, directly and a further 30,000 indirectly. It confirms that the core of the 2015 GA Strategy (which resulted in the incorporation of NPPF paragraph 104 f), remains as current government policy. It recognises that "Continuing population growth and demand for housing development means there are strong economic incentives for aerodrome owners to sell part or all of their land and more aerodromes may be lost to development". To address this, it aims "to recommend a methodology to identify the contribution of GA aerodromes to inform the development of a General Aviation Strategic Network (GASN) of aerodromes. The intention of the GASN is to ensure an appropriate balance between transport and housing development priorities, protecting the GA sector's contribution to the UK economy." The green paper consultation closes on 11 April 2019 and the Final Aviation 2050 Strategy is expected to be published in 2019. If adopted, Gamston would be included in the GASN based on the proposed criteria: Gamston is strategically geographically located, attracting aircraft owners and operators from a 35 mile radius. Registered owners are from Nottingham, Sheffield, Derby, Lincoln and Grantham. The Airport has a high quality, Civil Aviation Authority licensed hard runway of a length that accommodates business turbine and jet operations. It supports several fixed wing and helicopter training schools as well as a licensed maintenance facility. It provides flight support for business and private aircraft, with extensive, quality hangarage. ATC, fuel and customs are also all provided. Gamston won the National Airport Operators Association GA Airfield award, 2015. Recently there has been significant private investment in Gamston; providing a new control tower, extended hangarage, a helicopter training school, a growing maintenance facility and café. It is unfortunate and staggering that the Local Plan fails to recognise the significant District, Regional and National benefits that private investment has contributed.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP77	J Green		Gamston Airport and the Aviation related companies based there support the direct employment of between 40 and 50 full-time equivalent jobs. Para 12.10 is clearly ill-informed when compared with UK government policy. Para 12.10 presumably applies employment figures to the whole of what is referred to as the Gamston Airport site. Most of the land identified within this area is agricultural land. Only the land to the south east of the main runway and the runway itself is owned by the Airport and only this area is essential for the airport to operate. The land around the Runways is all farmed. Employment per hectare is therefore much higher than assumed by the above statement. The green paper, paragraph 7.21 comments that "in the longer term, serious consideration should be given to developing mixed use airfields, where GA, industry and housing can co-exist". Gamston could be a perfect model for this. Well over 1500 homes could be provided on a reduced site area lying within the currently identified site (map enclosed). Even taking account of the appropriate airport safeguarding requirements of the NPPF, the Garden Village and the airport could potentially co-exist.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP77	J Green		The All-Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation (APPG-GA) advocates that airfields should be given the same protections under planning law as other places of business, such as factories or music venues, allowing airfields to operate without challenges to their right to exist. It is understood that members of the APPG-GA, recently met with the Government's Director of Planning, Simon Gallagher, to discuss new planning guidelines aimed at further protecting airfields. It seems that the protection of GA airfields from housing will be forthcoming. The Local Plan could be overturned by legislation before reaching Final status. It would be logical to exclude Gamston Airport from the Local Plan and to only include this in subsequent versions of the Local Plan, if the anticipated legislation fails to materialise.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP77	J Green		The Plan estimates that demand for housing within the two Garden Villages by 2035 will be 1000 homes. It identifies that each site will ultimately accommodate 1500 and 2500 homes respectively. It identifies that these sites are to both include nursery and primary education, appropriate health care facilities and recreational space. Additionally the Gamston Airport site is to include a secondary education facility. The Local Plan does not need to identify sites for development beyond 2035 and it is not understood why Bassetlaw has sought to do this. 1000 homes are required by 2035 and the need for the associated amenities is understood and accepted. However, the logical way to ensure that this is achieved and funded is to commence the development of a single site and not to endeavour to develop two concurrent sites. Bevercotes Colliery is the obvious first development and this in isolation would satisfy demand up to 2035. There would be no requirement for any development at Gamston until post 2035. If the Authority still wishes to identify the potential second site for development beyond 2035, then to comply with the NPPF, this should be limited to the area to the north west of the Airport main runway and should take account of the airport safeguarding requirements.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP77	J Green		The Draft Plan identifies that the Community Infrastructure Levy, (CIL) "charges are more marginal for brownfield development". It is highly unlikely that the development of two brownfield sites (without the incorporation of any greenfield) could support the CIL charges in addition to the Section 106 Agreement works proposed and required to provide the new self contained communities. The fundability of the Draft Plan is questioned.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP78	N Roper		Am concerned how the proposal might impact on any future upgrades to the A1 which, in my opinion, will need to be addressed soon. Construction of the stretch of the A1 past Elkesley as a dual carriageway commenced in 1936 and completed after WW2. It runs East-West between Markham Moor and Five Lane Ends and between these junctions incorporates the A57 Lincoln to Liverpool trunk road. Except for the provision of bridges at Elkesley and Twyford Bridge, the road itself remains much as it was when first constructed. Both the Northbound and Southbound carriageways are subject to 50-mph speed limits at the point that the road passes Elkesley and Gamston Airfield; the northbound because of inadequate points of access to properties along the stretch and the southbound because of the sharp bend in the road adjacent to the airfield and Twyford Bridge. Highways Agency state that they wish to remove the 50-mph speed limit eventually, but major realignment of the road would be necessary. The volume of traffic using this stretch of road has increased exponentially in recent years (by 50% in 15-years / 40% in the last 5-years) resulting in daily hold-ups. Clearly the road is reaching the point of being inadequate and ideally should be three lanes rather than two. To underline the traffic increase even further; in the 1980's when I was Secretary to the 'Elkesley Bridge Action Group' there were 14,000 vehicles per day using the road. In 2016 the day count was 100,535, an increase of 618% but the road is essentially the same! There are currently very few buildings on the northern side of the A1 between West Drayton and Ranby thereby making its realignment more feasible than it would be if there were a new housing development on the proposed site. No objection to the residential development of the site but ask that due consideration is given to this issue. Undoubtedly the road will need to be upgraded and the only way for that is for it to be widened or re-routed using land on the northern side. Would hate public money to be wasted, because there was insufficient thought or meaningful consultation with local people with local knowledge.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP79	J Gilder	General Aviation Awareness Council	To be considered available for development a Brownfield site has to be Redundant, which as your para 12.10 clearly states is not the case. The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018. The loss of such an important airfield would fundamentally disrupt the existing network of General Aviation airfields in the Midlands and would severely impact on general aviation in the region. It would also be a significant deviation from the policy set out in the Government's General Aviation Strategy. The NPPF contains additional provisions relevant to the General Aviation community as they serve to reinforce the protection given to General Aviation airfields by the planning system. Appreciate that this is a draft Local Plan, there is no indication so far of any intention for it to include a specific policy recognising and protecting Gamston Aerodrome. The new provisions require local authorities not only recognise the intrinsic status of an airfield but also as part of a national transport network. NPPF Paragraph 104 states: 'Planning policies should...(f) recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy.' This new wording places a requirement on planning authorities to consider any General Aviation airfields in their plan making activities. Local planning authorities must now consider if an airfield should have its own planning policy, which would have to provide for change to occur. The closure of Tollerton Airport emphasises Gamston's intrinsic importance to the County and its contribution to the General Aviation network of airfields should be recognised in the Local Plan. It should also recognise its contribution to the local economy, and the provision of specialist employment with a bias towards the important STEM based activities focussed at an Airfield. The Local Authority has not identified its residential land allocations correctly and should re-evaluate the situation in relation to Gamston Airfield ensuring that all the measures currently in place to protect current and future aviation activities on and around the Aerodrome are understood, respected and protected into the future. This should be reinforced by an appropriate and robust Local Plan policy.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP82	J Baldwyn		House should not be built over Gamston Airport. Madness!	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP83	J Milner		To treat the whole of an airfield as brownfield is simply wrong, it misinterprets planning guidance which is to consider the curtilage of the current developed areas as brownfield not the whole airfield. Airfields such as Gamston should be considered part of the UK's critical infrastructure for transport both national and international as is common practice elsewhere in Europe, in the US and farther afield. Because of the way they are managed they are havens for wildlife including, insects, birds (which comes as a surprise to many), plants and provides a contribution to the area's "green lung". To replace all this by a euphemistically described "garden village" is not planning it's vandalism. I know this because I live in an area of outstanding natural beauty which contains a number of airfields all of which are valued and thriving. Indeed next time you fly in a Boeing or an Airbus reflect on the fact that the undercarriage and a good few other components were manufactured at an airfield in Gloucestershire! Would like to continue to visit relatives by flying into Gamston rather than driving for hours on end. Could develop the industrial capacity of the airfield and improve the population of high skilled jobs and benefit the economy.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP84	S Denver		Object to the garden Village housing plan at Retford Airport. So many airfields are at risk of being lost this way. Soon there will be no airfields left for general aviation. We already have a shortage of trainee pilots with aviation set to expand over the next 10 years. Also this airfield is the ideal home of the Children's Air ambulance.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP86	J Robinson		Who are you people, stop messing with things that work for the community and come up with something that actually helps the community without any detrimental effects.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP87	R Lee		Do not support the plans for creating a garden village on Retford airport. This is land that is used for lots of employment and provides good infrastructure for the local area and brings employment to the area. The airport employs a large number of people already and with the growing need for general aviation the sector is only growing.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP88	D Skorin		Object to the proposals to create a new village at Gamston airport. This will have a detrimental effect on both the local and wider community. The airport has excellent facilities and is used frequently. For a local airport it has a long runway and can accommodate private jets & vintage aircraft, it has facilities to refuel all aircraft and is used frequently by the medical helicopters. The airport has a very good restaurant and employs many staff as well as the fire brigade, control tower, auxiliary facilities and flight school. The airport acts as a focal point for the surrounding villages and has in the past also hosted charity events, and private vintage car rallies. The proposal will remove a large area of open space and have detrimental effect on the landscape	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP89	C Sutton		Object to the proposed plan at Gamston - UNLESS at least 600m length of the existing runway(s) and reasonable ground handling space including hangarage for aircraft parking, is retained – and that those facilities are enabled to continue in perpetuity for General Aviation flying operations. Suggest that the Council takes the lead from Stratford County Council who showing leadership in this area regarding Wellesbourne. Such mixed use arrangements would enable the accommodation of new house building AS WELL AS retaining the nations' airfield flying amenities – the latter of which is supported by the largest All Party Parliamentary Group, the APPG [the APPG has 207 MP members - see http://www.generalaviationappg.uk/airfields/]	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP91	S Freek	Highways England	Highways England is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). Role is to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In Bassetlaw principal interest is safeguarding the operation of the A1 which bisects the Local Plan area, and the M1 which is approximately 8km to the west of the district's western boundary. Gamston Airfield and Bevercotes Colliery sites at Elkesley, are north and south of the A1. It is anticipated that these two sites shall deliver around 4,000 new homes, 1,000 of which would come forward within the Plan period. From review of Figure 9 access onto the A1 would be served by the existing junction with the B6387. Welcome the statement that the Council will encourage sustainable transport links between these two sites crossing the A1 to help to ensure that any adverse impacts of additional traffic are minimised.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP94	M Slater		Horried and dismayed about wanting to remove this fantastic airfield and all the facilities there, oppose this plan. Gamston Airfield is something you should be proud to have. It has a reputation in General Aviation of being Friendly Professional and Safe with the latest aid in Navigation suitable for all aircraft. Seen what work they do and the excitement in both young and old people of having a gateway into aviation so close by, I'm typical of the majority of people who use the airfield, However what everyone on the airfield has is a passion for aviation and a passion to share that with others. It's frustrating that a minority of enthusiastic people with such a specialised interest has to suffer for a housing estate with a nice name (gardens) property development has a place but surely not with such an awful price. Gamston, is a provider of full service airborne sensing solutions that operates a fleet of 10 'special mission' equipped aircraft fulfilling UK government and European agency contracts for airborne intelligence, surveillance & reconnaissance and aerial survey work. Also the European headquarters of a multinational company who have a reputation as world leaders in providing flight inspection, navigation, communication and calibration services for air transportation. They work with navigational aids, airfield lighting and communications equipment for civilian and military use and provide real time passenger information for public transport operators. Aircraft continuing airworthiness management, sales & contract maintenance, ground handling services for visiting business aircraft, passengers and pilots. The UK & Eire distributor for aircraft manufactured by Diamond Aircraft Industries of Austria. Five businesses are engaged in pilot training to European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) and Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) standards, aircraft rental and trial flying lessons for local people. An excellent café and restaurant often visited as much by local residents as aircraft operators. A number of other local businesses, including providers of engineering and aviation services rely on the airport and visiting aircraft as a source of work. Nottinghamshire Police use the site (between 12 and 15 times per annum) to deliver advanced driver training in tactical pursuit and containment. Aircraft owners and the Retford-Gamston based flying schools demonstrate a socially responsible approach to engaging with the wider community to improve knowledge of STEM subjects. For example, a recent children's charity day involving educational activities and a flying experience for local children.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP95	J Stewart		As a user of Retford/Gamston airport, object to the Bassetlaw plan on the grounds that it involves closing the airport. In general I am in favour of new developments, but not at the expense of closing down such a unique local facility.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP96	P Steeden		Concerned regarding the possible closure of Gamston airport in connection with a proposed new development. Have visited the airport on a number of occasions and am aware that it provides employment for a significant number of skilled people. It is also a centre for leisure, for those learning to fly, for those such as myself with aviation interests, and also for others, such as cyclists, who regularly stop there to use the splendid cafe facilities. Live near Blackpool whose airport is also being developed. However in our case the development is being built around the airport and the money raised is being used to protect the runway and infrastructure. A plan, allowing some development, but which allows the airport to remain open and thrive is preferable to one under which the airport would close. The convenience of smaller airports such as Gamston which are able to handle European business flights provide a significant incentive for inward investment, which might otherwise be located elsewhere.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP98	B Dawson		The plan to demolish Gamston Airport for housing is in my opinion unsound as it does not adequately give weight to the benefits the general area gains from the Airport, in terms of business and jobs, and its loss would be in grave detriment to the locality.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP100	C Mildred		Why is it that local politicians fail to see the benefits of a local airport. Once it is gone it is gone and all will be the poorer for that. Yes you need homes but we also need employment, if you end up sending everything to Heathrow, London will have and keep all business. Wake up and protect the north.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP102	S Walker		As an ex flying school student and a customer of the Gamston Flying School and other services at the airport, cannot believe that would consider using the site for housing when it employs so many people in many varied businesses. The airfield opened in December 1942 as part of the Royal Air Force Training Command, was withdrawn from military service in 1957 and modernised as a general and business aviation airport from 1993. Many historical features remain, including a World War Two era firing range and other buildings that have been adapted for industrial, commercial and residential use. Two of the original three runways remain available, one of which is still used. Five thriving flying schools based at the site, continue a tradition of flying training, each school provides training to standards required by the UK Civil Aviation Authority and the European Aviation Safety Agency. The airfield is equipped with a range of modern facilities that are not routinely available at similar sized airports including pilot controlled lighting and a co-located navigation aids. The runways at Gamston are long enough to accommodate light jet aircraft for business, charter operations and medical evacuation flights and private flying and helicopter operations. General and Business aviation contributes between £2 and 3 billion to the UK economy and relies upon a strategic network of airfields, this has recently been recognised in UK planning policy (but not referenced in the Plan). Hundreds of aircraft from around the UK and the rest of Europe regularly visit the airport because it provides vital transport links for businesses in Retford, Nottingham, Lincoln and Sheffield City Region. Military aircraft primarily helicopters, occasionally use the airport and royal helicopter flights refuel at the airport. Gamston is able to accommodate traffic that would not be able to gain access to larger facilities, e.g. Doncaster-Sheffield Airport. Following the closure of Sheffield City Airport, Gamston is one of the only airports of its size in the region, serving the needs of the business aviation and flying training sectors. Proposals will destroy nationally important aviation infrastructure, risk the loss of approx 100 highly skilled jobs and close or relocate businesses providing Science, Technology, Engineering and Pilot Training services.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP102	S Walker		The plan: - does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in NPPF para 104f. Have not considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. - Para 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. Contradicts para 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create. - Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as "brownfield" - planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. - Other airports across the region are unable to accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also homes a Children's Air Ambulance. - The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport and in the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development). - The plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksoop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. The plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure. The plan drastically underestimates the scale of potential job losses and the value of the airport in providing highly specialised services to the local and national economy. Section 3.2 of the plan states that "The single significant negative effect relates to the loss of employment land through cessation of airport operations. However, the scale of employment opportunities is likely to be relatively limited" and goes on to say that new jobs will be created in the 'garden village' that would replace the airport. Any jobs are likely to be low skilled, small in number and far lower paid at the Airport. The following publically available data describe some of the businesses based at Retford airport, including:- provider of full service airborne sensing solutions that operates a fleet of 10 'special mission' equipped aircraft fulfilling UK government and European agency contracts for airborne intelligence, surveillance & reconnaissance and aerial survey work. - European HQ of a multinational company with a reputation as world leaders in providing flight inspection, navigation, communication and calibration services for air transportation. Work with navigational aids, airfield lighting and communications equipment for civilian and military use and provide real time passenger information for public transport operators. -Aircraft continuing airworthiness management, sales & contract maintenance. - Ground handling services for visiting business aircraft, passengers and pilots. - The UK & Eire distributor for Diamond Aircraft Industries of Austria.- Five businesses train pilots to EASA and CAA standards, rent aircraft and offer flying lessons.- An excellent café and restaurant.-A number of other local businesses, including providers of engineering and aviation services rely on the airport and aircraft for work. Nottinghamshire Police use the site (12 - 15 times pa) for advanced driver training in tactical pursuit and containment.-Aircraft owners and the flying schools demonstrate a socially responsible approach to engaging with the wider community to improve knowledge of STEM subjects e.g., a recent children's charity day.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP103	T Richards		Find the fact that you are even considering this totally deplorable. The airport and what it has to offer is of great importance to a lot of people, and has been for many years. Use the airfield quite regularly to use my private pilots licence. Urge you to reconsider your proposal, and try to find a way of leaving the airfield operational.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for
DBLP104	R Howard		Object to the plan to build houses on Gamston Airfield, this would be big mistake. Use Gamston Airport with my aircraft so this development would prevent me using Gamston any more. Fly to France quite often and France seem to have an airport at most towns and cities and this helps the local businesses to be reached by air thus helping the local economy and you need to keep Gamston Airport open to serve local businesses. Gamston with being next to the A1 puts the airport in a very strong position to serve other towns in the area as it does at the moment. Places like the old Bevercotes mine site would be a far better use of derelict land and maintain the airport for the local economy and would be still next to the A1. Cannot understand where the local jobs will come from for the people living in these houses so they will have to travel to find work so the A1 will keep the traffic off the local roads.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP105	P Carlton		Complain about the proposed plans to close Gamston airfield. Use this airfield literally hundreds of times during my flying career and have found it to be friendly and well run. This airfield has and does provide a vital and valuable aviation asset to the whole community in general. For years innumerable pilots have taken advantage of the facilities provided by this small but fantastic place. To destroy the work of years along with dozens of jobs and the facilities provided would indeed be a criminal act. Gamston Airfield is in a position perfectly placed for aircraft transiting north to south and vice versa, providing fuel, food and a safe haven when the weather deteriorates. Strongly urge the council to think again and look to more plausible brown field site for their planned developments.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more
DBLP106	A Daley		Have an aircraft based at Gamston Airport since November 1999. Object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to redevelop the airfield. - does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields outlined in NPPF paragraph 104f and have not considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. - Para 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport contradict para 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create - Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as "brownfield" - planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. -Other airports across the region are unable to accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft and the Children's Air Ambulance. - The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and in the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) elsewhere in the plan. - makes a case for local housing need in Worksoop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. States that Retford has experienced significant housing growth since 2011, without the need to destroy existing infrastructure. Drastically underestimates the scale of potential job losses and the value of the airport in providing highly specialised services to the local and national economy. Section 3.2 states that "The single significant negative effect relates to the loss of employment land through cessation of airport operations. However, the scale of employment opportunities is likely to be relatively limited" and adds that new jobs will be created in the 'garden village' that would replace the airport. Any jobs created likely to be low skilled, smaller in number and far lower paid than those provided by existing airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP106	A Daley		The following from publically available data describes some of the services at the airport:- A provider of full service airborne sensing solutions that operates a fleet of 10 'special mission' equipped aircraft fulfilling UK government and European agency contracts for airborne intelligence, surveillance & reconnaissance and aerial survey work.- The European hq of a multinational company who have a reputation as world leaders in providing flight inspection, navigation, communication and calibration services for air transportation. They work with navigational aids, airfield lighting and communications equipment for civilian and military use and provide real time passenger information for public transport operators. -Aircraft continuing airworthiness management, sales & contract maintenance. - Ground handling services for visiting business aircraft, passengers and pilots. - The UK & Eire distributor for aircraft manufactured by Diamond Aircraft Industries of Austria. - Five businesses provide pilot training to EASA and CAA standards, aircraft rental and trial flying lessons for local people.-An excellent café and restaurant. -other local businesses, including providers of engineering and aviation services rely on the airport and visiting aircraft as a source of work.- Nottinghamshire Police use the site (12 - 15 times pa) for advanced driver training in tactical pursuit and containment.-Aircraft owners and the flying schools demonstrate a socially responsible approach to engaging with the wider community to improve knowledge of STEM subjects e.g., a recent children's charity day. From personal experience this resource is incorrectly characterised - the plan seeks to minimise the value of the airfield over its alternative potential use. Gamston is a valuable local airport and the redevelopment should not be allowed.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP107	R Hunter		The proposal to build a garden village on the airport dismay me. There is now clear nationally acknowledged guidance in the NPPF asked to be importance of general aviation on this country's economy and infrastructure. The plan underestimates the job losses involved, the impact upon the areas prosperity generally and the cultural significance of the site which has been an airfield since the 1940's. Understand that there are other suitable site to find destruction of an airfield with such a long history and food shop particular longer be available for future generations is a disaster. Strongly urge you to reconsider.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP108	Dr P Riley		Do not live in your area, but in Leicestershire, where I have been for approximately 30 years. Am a keen and active private pilot, and have flown into Gamston often over that period, my wife; who also trained as a pilot has also flown into the airfield on a number of occasions. Gamston is a well equipped and efficiently run airfield, yet very welcoming to visitors. Apart from being a pleasant field to fly into, with an excellent restaurant, it has a very well respected training establishment. Need to do some refresher training on instrument flying, and will come to Gamston to undertake that because the facilities on offer, and the location beat anywhere else that is readily available. Know that airfields are currently classed as brownfield sites, following an oversight in legislation introduced by John Prescott. As a result, a number are under threat of redevelopment. Feel strongly that this is very shortsighted. Quite apart from a leisure activity, light aviation is an important part of our country's infrastructure, and shortsighted pillaging of that infrastructure is not, in my opinion, in the national interest.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP109	C Borchardt		This must STOP. Stop destroying UK aviation by closing valuable airfields for the sake of a cheap housing development option. Soon there will be no airfields to land/operate from, ruining the future of a huge aviation business infrastructure and economy not to mention the future supply of airline pilots. Airfields provide a myriad of benefits to local communities not least assisting the maintenance of green fields assisting nature and 'Green and pleasant land'! Insist on the wealthy developers ONLY being granted planning permission on previously used 'Brown Field' sites, not Green Field areas. Know they are only interested in profits and green is a lot cheaper to develop. Not our problem! Less profit and more common sense is essential to maintain the environment we know, need and live so much.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP111	P Headland		Appreciate that there is a need for extra housing in Bassetlaw, as there is in most of the country. The two sites proposed have very different criteria. The airfield is in active use and has several businesses active on site. It is a general aviation facility for the region, which is an asset. Land must be redundant (i.e. unused) for inclusion in Local Authority lists of 'Land suitable for development', by definition active airfields are, therefore, not subject to the presumption that development should be allowed. Also understand that airfields are 'described' as brownfield sites, and not 'designated'. The plan uses the word 'classified'. The old pit site has been unused for many years, apart from illegal activities, and is an ideal site for development. In favour of development of the pit site, but not the airfield.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP112	H Petrie		Cannot stress what a pleasure it has been to learn to fly at Gamston, the layout of the facility, the members of staff in all aspects of the airport instructors or otherwise, have kept and held Gamston airport in highest level of efficiency and standards, to that of larger airports. Writing as a student pilot wish for Gamston to be saved as, from a location point of view it is most convenient as I do not have to travel far to continue training or hour building for further advancement in a hopeful aviation career. Gamston airfield is a great place to fly and meet people, in my time at Gamston have not met anyone that I would not like to meet again, even if it was for a coffee. From the instructors to the café, ground team/fire and rescue to those who work in the offices and the tower, Gamston is a wholesome community who work together very well and very hard, who would also help you with whatever problem you had, in the air or on the ground. As an individual without a mind for business, unable to address what the financial advantages would be for or against this possible development. The only appeal I can make is on an empathetic level and hope that is enough to help stir, the decision to leave Gamston in its current state and location, allowing all its staff to keep their employment in turn letting the students continue their aspirations towards a career in aviation, or simply to obtain a PPL/LAPL license which is an extraordinary achievement. Gamston means a great deal, not only to those who work there, but also those who train there, the airport itself is located in a great position for flying as well as the occasional host for other smaller jet aircraft, National Grid etc.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP113	A Slater		Gamston is one of the few airfields in our area that is professionally managed, well equipped with a long solid runway maintained to a high level. It can not only deal with light aircraft but business jets, helicopter e.g. police and children's air ambulance. On site schools for pilot training have a wide remit, from pleasure flights to first steps on the pathway towards commercial flying, encompassing all the educational milestones and examinations necessary. This facility provides badly needed technically highly skilled jobs for local people. New housing can be built elsewhere in the area but Gamston cannot and would not be able to be replicated at a cost to make it viable. Bassetlaw would be losing a unique resource whose reputation is second to none in its field.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP114	F Watts	Contrail Flight Service Ltd	Dismayed and disappointed to see the plans to build on the airfield at Gamston, thus destroying the Airport. Surely developing the derelict Bevercotes colliery site would provide adequate housing for the foreseeable future and would not have any negative effects on employment or facilities. Worked at Gamston Airport for over 35 years and have seen the Airport develop from a barely used landing strip to the excellent professional facility it is today. This company provides pilots and management services for business aircraft as well as handling services for visiting aircraft. Handle aircraft from most of UK and Europe visiting the area, mainly for business purposes. This involves more business for local firms by way of taxi and hotel bookings etc. The airport provides employment for around 100 people and hangarage for 80-100 aircraft valued at several million pounds. The fact that the Bassetlaw has an airport, at no cost to the public purse, is a great way to encourage businesses to establish themselves in the area. This proposal is not in compliance with government policy towards General Aviation (i.e. non airline flying) and should, therefore, be rejected – It's not a planning policy, its vandalism. PLEASE DO NOT DESTROY 35 YEARS OF HARDWORK – OR ALL OUR JOBS	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP116	T Cooper		As a part-owner of a thriving limited company based at Gamston) object to the Plan. Section 3.2, Results of the Bassetlaw New Settlement Study Methodology relative to Gamston Airport states: "The single significant negative effect relates to the loss of employment land through cessation of airport operations. However, the scale of employment opportunities is likely to be relatively limited" There are roughly 100 often highly skilled jobs provided at the airport, either directly by the airport or on-site café (Gamston Aviation), 5 Approved Training Organisations (ATOs) and Declared Training Organisations (DTOs) which provide training towards European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) standards and other specialised aviation related businesses including the children's air ambulance. Many of these businesses provide employment in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) roles directly. Para 12.9 of the Plan states: "Whilst development of the site would result in a loss of airport related employment the new village would provide opportunities for new employment" All businesses at the airport are specialised and require an airport site to operate from. Other airports across the region are unable to accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the 'garden village'. Many other airfields would also be effected as multiple local airfields provide maintenance facilities that Gamston-based aircraft use. The Plan underestimates the scale of potential job losses and the value of the airport in providing highly specialised services to the local and national economy. There is also a contradiction as the Visions and Objectives chapter in Section 4 of the Draft Plan states: "Facilitating development opportunities that will enhance Bassetlaw's economy through the delivery of new and the expansion of existing enterprises, providing jobs across urban and rural Bassetlaw." Section 3.2 makes clear: "In order for the Bassetlaw Plan to be successfully developed and adopted, it will need to be in conformity with the NPPF" However, the NPPF Section 9, 104(f) requires planning policies should: "recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy." It is clear that the Draft Plan is not taking the above point into account and is not in conformity with the NPPF and is wrong to consider the airport as "inefficient use of land" (12.10). Reconsider replacing a valuable local asset with houses and instead look elsewhere at poorly-utilised land (such as the Bevercotes site) redevelopment of which will not effect existing business and operations.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP117	R Moncrief		What a disgrace by the Council to seek to build on the Gamston Airfield. Gamston airport is probably the best General Aviation airfield in the Country. Also it has been there for years and a satellite airfield during the Second World War. Not all the businesses that work out of the airport can relocate. Also the 100 or so aircraft that are located there would find it difficult to relocate as the majority require a hard runway. If it is Council policy to shut business down it should be prepared to set aside a fund for compensation to the people who have business interest there and also to the people who have aircraft there. It could cost millions. If compulsory purchase of the airfield goes ahead alternative accommodation should be offered by the Council and of course a hard runway.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP118	T and C Hyndman		Express our worries with regards to traffic management. Live in Gamston on the B6387. This road already has very heavy traffic at certain times of the day, and the acute bend in the road at the river and junction with Rectory Lane (which has seen a recent car accident resulting in the car land in the river) causes us to worry about it being unable to cope with the additional numbers of vehicles that the new village would create. Consider the possibility of providing another route into Retford from the new village (such as via Jockey Lane). Have concerns re any possible effect on the wild and bird life in the area. Currently there is a line of trees to the east side of the airport which provides for a great range of bird habitat including buzzards. It would be very sad to see this habitat lost. Do not oppose the plans to build a new village but do feel that great care is needed to be able to maintain the rural beauty that makes this area so attractive.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP119	M Lindsley	The Coal Authority	Note that it is proposed to take forward a strategic growth allocation at the former Bevercotes Colliery site. As you will be aware there are mine entries on the site and would expect the risks that these pose to the development to be considered and identified. This should ensure that the implications that these features may pose to the quantum and layout of any development on the site are properly considered in order to ensure its safety and stability.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP120	R Swannack		In principle, not against the idea of building more affordable homes in the area. Do not think the roads in the vicinity are capable of accepting any more traffic than at present. If the development in Gamston does proceed, then there should be a link road built from the present southern end of airfield onto the A1. The current road through Gamston village (past where Bramcote school used to be) is busy enough as it is – and there are many accidents involving cars failing to take the very tight bend over the river bridge – in fact, 3 in the past few days. Even the first stage of the development would result in very many more vehicles using this road, as presumably Retford will be the initial destination for shopping, using the railway station etc. The main London Road into Retford is also extremely busy for much of the day, and even worse during the morning and evening rush, plus school turning out time. Any more traffic would cause much more congestion.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP121	Dr R Murray		Object to the Garden Village on the site of Gamston Airport. The planning department have been grossly misinformed in relation to the long term deleterious economic impact to the Bassetlaw Area, which would result from the closure of Gamston Airport. The plan states: "It is currently a small scale, commercial enterprise which serves the needs of local businesses. Whilst development of the site would result in a loss of airport related employment, the new village would provide opportunities for new employment." This is in error. My brief research has revealed the following. The site is a highly active airfield providing valuable services and skilled employment to the local and wider community. Specifically, there are a number of specialist technical companies based on the site, providing 80-100 skilled jobs. These include support for the national aerospace infrastructure and the military. A number of non based companies rely on the presence of the site to maintain further local skilled employment. 5 flight training organisations, providing professional and private pilot training, rely on the site for their continued existence. The airport is employed as a training facility by the military and by the police for training drivers and search dogs. The National Children's Air Ambulance is based at Gamston and the airfield is used for the movement of transplanted organs and seriously ill patients. The airport has some 18,000 aircraft movements per annum, is home to 50 - 100 aircraft and is used by well over 1,000 pilots. In 2015 the airport received The UK Airport Operators Association award as "The Best General Aviation Airport". Were the plan to be adopted, employment would be temporarily provided during the construction of housing and some limited employment would persist to service the new housing. On balance, the long term loss of skilled employment would be devastating to the local and wider community. The loss of the site would have a significant effect on the national aerospace infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP122	H Gay		Quickly scanning the full document there appears to be a number of inconsistencies in the housing requirements that appear to be driving the plan and a clearly a misunderstanding of the challenges of rural communities. The airfield is described as an inefficient use of land. It is not as the infield are all farmed and in productive arable use. It's described as brownfield. It is not. The runways may be but the infield is in agricultural use. The airfield and land within the runways provide a habitat for brown hare, skylarks and deer. The perimeter dispersal bays are in use as industrial storage and the cross runway is in use as mineral reclaims business. The edge nearest the A1 is in industrial use but clearly not attractive to distribution as the business on there as just ceased. The airfield is a valuable amenity. It handles small jets and light aircraft enabling air travel from Bassetlaw to Europe and the rest of the UK for business. It is something that could be usefully used to sell the economic benefits of the area. Removing the airfield will mean the closure of the airfield and the loss of jobs for those employed there. Furthermore it will be a loss of economic activity for Bassetlaw as the businesses and plane owners will have to take their business elsewhere. Any house built on the Gamston site will be subject to perpetual noise from the A1. The Bevercotes site is protected by the land topography. That noise will increase when the Twyford bridge improvements are done as the Highways authority have stated the 50 limit will be increased back to 70 mph. Transport proposals are not clear in the plan and will mean anyone living there will need a car. Those at Bevercotes are more likely to travel west to Ollerton than Retford. The report does not understand the challenges of rural living. The provision of viable shops health care and education are not clear and given the various authorities in ability to organise such matters in an urban setting not convinced they can do so in a rural one.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP123	M Swannack		Where are you going to build new access roads to these large 'villages'? The current roads in these areas are small, narrow roads that are not designed to take the large increase in traffic (including large lorries etc). There are two small bridges in Gamston, one in Eaton and one in Ordsall none of which are suitable for heavy vehicles and there are already frequent accidents on them. Building a new access route onto the A1 will not solve the traffic problems as traffic will still want to access Retford, which is the nearest small town. Retford town centre is dying – it is full of charity shops and coffee shops but major retailers have left the town or are not interested in moving into the town. How are you going to persuade large shops, ie Marks and Spencer, to move to Retford and then provide the additional parking etc needed? Where and how are you going to provide all the additional hospital facilities that this large increase in numbers will necessitate? Bassetlaw Hospital and A & E already struggle to cope and Doncaster Hospital is no better. Where are you proposing these people are going to work? How are you going to attract new businesses to the area? It is not sufficient to think new businesses will arrive just because a lot more people will be living here.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP124	J Arbon		It seems really ill thought out as a knee jerk reaction to land becoming available. Could not support these plans, and it seems neither can you... Before deciding on Bevercoates and Gamston Airport seem to discount the areas entirely based on poor roads, amenities and local provisions. See that these pockets of land are ready to be developed but with the current roads and facilities available they simply are unsuitable. Have you ever tried to get through Gamston on any road when the A1 is shut? Have you ever seen cars run off the road at the bend in Gamston ft down into a river? Have you attended Gamston Primary School at pick up time? The current car park can't cope for the 100 kids it's already got, and that isn't council land. So siting that there is a local primary school is totally irrelevant. Bevercoates isn't much better, you site that there are two access roads to the A1 - this is in fact incorrect without disturbing traffic through other local villages, this extra road is in fact a private road, so even if the road was bought would need to be widened over two river crossings. Bevercoates, especially, on each map on your plan is outside the 4k marked areas for everything but a school. It seem like other areas have been rejected based on the fact that land isn't available, and whilst that is a valid point, why not just state that. Cannot support either of these developments without a way the council are going to substantially improve conditions in the area first. It's no point suggesting that the development will bring these facilities and jobs, when it's been 14yrs since a similar development in Clipstone (then known as Kings Clipstone) and they are still waiting for any such resources.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP126	A and H Salmon		Been residents of Gamston for nearly 40 yrs. and can see no benefit in the proposed planning for these areas. It seems to us that there is a chicken and egg situation here in that there is nowhere for people to work! In order to attract people to an area you need places of employment, THERE ISN'T ANY. There is NO industry in this area for anything like this amount of people nor can the infrastructure stand every household having TWO plus cars each. Neither are you building houses that people want. Not everyone wants 3/4/5 bedrooms and as many bathrooms. Would like for YOU to sell me a plot of land that I can build my own BUNGALOW to my own design, so that my wife and I can down size and sell my present large house and garden to someone who will enjoy it for 40yrs. or more. Give the people with their own money the opportunity to build what they want and not what some crackpot builder, planner or architect think they should have.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP127	C Robinson	TwelveTwentyOne Planning Services on behalf of Hamlin Estates	Supports the proposal for garden villages. The reliance, albeit limited, on two new villages is debatable and has to be treated with caution. New villages inevitably prove contentious and, if approved, will require substantial infrastructure and other establishment costs. This can prove a deterrent to delivery - an issue that will likely prove to be intractable for two new settlements so close to one another where they will predate upon the same housing market.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP128	S Richards		Strongly object to this plan. Live on Hather Close/Rectory Lane and the amount of heavy traffic that uses this road is already on the increase without the building of 4000 extra homes, which will cause more traffic. The junction onto the great north road from Rectory Lane is already congested at peak times and these extra houses will only make it worse. Are pensioners and are already struggling with crossing Rectory Lane to get to the bus stop on North Road owing to the amount of traffic and the blind summit across from where we live. The building of these villages will turn, what once was a lovely peaceful village into a very busy and over populated area. Are there not enough new builds going up in Retford and surrounding areas without adding more. Retford isn't big enough for all these developments, we have not got enough facilities to justify these extra houses. Retford is a small quaint market town and it will end up being near as damn it to a city without the facilities. Strongly disapprove of these plans.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP130	J Beckett		Object to the proposed closure of Gamston Airport for housing development as outlined in the Bassetlaw Plan. The airport is a vital amenity for the surrounding area providing both high quality jobs and flight training opportunities for the local population. It is also an important base for the rescue helicopter which cannot be easily replaced. There are other more suitable sites in the area for the provision of housing that will not entail the loss of an important source of local employment.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP131	B Edgeworth	ManEdge Ltd	Any development that will reduce the number of operation airfields in the UK is without a doubt short sighted. Aviation plays a key part in the transportation infrastructure off the UK, the airfield is home to many services that support both military and civil services for the UK. This plan does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in NPPF paragraph 104f. The closure of Gamston that is the base to a number of local businesses and provides a home for the Children's Air Ambulance seems a very poor choice when other brown sites are available. Do not appear to have considered the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs. Will result in a direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and as there is no other airfield sites that can take all these facilities resulting in a loss to the region. These jobs include flight training, engineering, and the support services. The mentioned of work generation by the 'garden village' is total unsubstantiated and has no basis in fact and cannot remove the fact that this development will create real highly skilled job losses, this plan directly contradicts one of its strategic objectives of economic development. Whereas, a partial development of the site allowing for the continued operation of the airfield could bring valuable additional work to the local economy. Do not support the closure of Gamston and wish objection to be noted. Support a development of the site retaining the active airfield to meet both local and UK needs.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP132	M Green		Registering my total opposition to the proposal for the building of two garden villages in the Gamston/Bevercotes areas. The village of Gamston does not have the infrastructure to support such massive development as is proposed for the airport site. It is a quiet hamlet of less than 80 houses and such developments will totally destroy the whole ethos of the place along with increasing traffic on the side roads that were never meant to cope with this volume of occupation. Indeed Retford will not be able to cope with an influx of some 4000 new families. Let's not dress up the facts by calling these "Garden Villages" they are quite simply huge housing estates. My understanding is that these homes are affordable housing and not private developments. The reputation of such developments sadly precedes them. Being adjacent to such a project will inevitably have a negative impact on the value of existing properties. People who live in Gamston have made a conscious decision not to live in built up areas and to have this choice taken away from them is totally wrong. Police, fire, medical services and schools in the area are already stretched to the limit as a result of small scale private developments and the whole system simply would not cope with the influx even if school and medical facilities were incorporated into the villages.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP133	K Stubbs		Like to object most strongly to the Gamston development on three basic points. Firstly the proposed removal of the airport facilities, which is a very big employer in this local area. Secondly the amount of traffic it will generate On the local roads particularly in our little village of Eaton. Thirdly the loss of the food producing area that will be lost completely.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for

DBLP134	D Wright		It is about time something was done with the Bevercotes site, since the current owners seem to be unwilling to continue with their planned industrial development and it has been a derelict neglected eyesore for many years since the closure of the pit. The only use that it has had since that time has been for illegal raves every so often, blighting the local villages. However, the Gamston airfield is a different matter entirely. Who in gods name thinks it's a good idea to remove a totally viable business venture which has been in place for many years, to replace it with a new village, when there is equally usable waste land just the other side of Jockey House Lane which could be used for the project and not 100 metres away. It seems to be a case of the owner, wanting to offload the site, and BDC taking the easy option instead of considering alternatives. Jobs will be lost, and opportunities missed if this part of the plan is allowed to see fruition. They have the option to rid the area of unused land that has been derelict for decades, but instead are willing to sacrifice a perfectly good business and attribute to the area. Not near enough to Gamston to be affected by any development there, but am certainly opposed to the plan for the reasons set out above.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Dispute that the proposed new garden villages (to the south of Retford) should be considered to deliver development to address a "percentage of the local housing market in Retford". Such a policy approach serves only to remove housing needs from where they are needed, increase commuting and harming sustainability. Consider that the garden villages should be removed from the Local Plan and that growth as it relates to the housing market at Retford should be allocated towards Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP137	M Frost		Register my concern over the proposed garden villages for Gamston and Bevercotes. Moved to Eaton village 20 yrs ago because of it's quiet old village charm and beautiful views. Over the years some of the charm has been eroded particularly by the amount of road traffic speeding through the village. Cyclists, walkers, horse riders and large farm vehicles use the road daily and the amount of speeding traffic has become a great worry, it's only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. For the second time in a few years the bridge has been damaged due to vehicles colliding with it. With the amount of houses proposed, Eaton village will not cope with the increased traffic flow.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP138	L Carter	Bothamsall Parish Council	Building 2 new villages in close proximity will have an unacceptable impact on our local, rural infrastructure. Support the development of 1 new village at Bevercotes because this site is clearly a brownfield site which requires reuse and redevelopment. It is currently well screened and allows the opportunity of a blank canvas in the style and character of the new village (Screening must be maintained and in areas improved). Do not support the development of a new village at Gamston airport because the site may be technically brownfield, but much of it is undeveloped agricultural land with the remainder in employment use. Not convinced that even upgraded roads and infrastructure could acceptably accommodate both new villages and that the total dwellings proposed in the 2 new villages are too high. Gamston airport currently provides local employment and has the potential to draw in investment by continuing as a local airport servicing local businesses. The loss of Gamston airport may affect the height of aircraft passing over the local area destined to or traveling from neighbouring airports.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP139	A Fenton		Live in Eaton Village and understand the need for extra housing for an increasing population and can certainly see some positives about this planned development such as better transport links and facilities for the area. Am worried about the increase in traffic through Eaton village which would be inevitable without a change in the road network. The road is narrow, especially on the bridge in the middle of the village, a large section of the village has no path for pedestrians and the road is regularly used by cyclists, horse riders and agricultural traffic. In the 3 years I have lived here, have had two cars lose control on the bend nearby and end up in our front garden (both drivers admitted to driving too quickly), the street light on the same bend was demolished and the bridge has been severely damaged on two occasions, the most recent only last weekend. Worry that with any increase in traffic would come more of these kind of accidents and also be detriment to the character of the village. Any incident on the nearby A1 often leads to a vast increase of traffic through the village too, including large lorries ignoring the weight limit signs. Appreciate these incidents are sporadic but it does highlight the pressure the road through Eaton is under. Hope that a new garden village at Gamston would include a change to the road infrastructure that would help tackle this, or at the very least, some proper traffic calming system through Eaton. As Ordsall spreads outwards towards Eaton and the new garden village is developed near Gamston, would Eaton lose the green areas between these areas and effectively be swallowed up in the future. Are these green belt areas and would they remain so?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP140	S Ramsden		It is with great sadness that hear that there may be plans to destroy Gamston Airport. The airport has been an asset to the local community for years and is the home to many successful businesses and employers, providing both jobs and local economy to the area. Strongly object to the potential plan to close the airport and hope that some sense prevails and these houses and built on an area that will not adversely affect so many people.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP141	R Ingle		Object to proposals to close Gamston Airport because of: the loss of nationally important aviation infrastructure and the consequential loss of approximately 100 highly skilled technical jobs; [The loss of a strategically important element of a national airfields infrastructure which collectively contributes between £2 to £3 billion annually to the UK economy; forced closure or relocation of businesses providing Science, Technology and Engineering facilities; the loss of five separate Pilot & Flight training businesses, which would be unlikely to be successful in relocating to any alternative 'local' airfield; the loss of runways which are long enough to accommodate light jet aircraft for business, charter operations and medical evacuation flights, otherwise not available within the local area. (Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposals); the cessation and removal of important business trade from the local economy due to the loss of many hundreds of visiting aircraft from around the UK and the rest of Europe regularly utilising the primary transport links for businesses in Retford, Nottingham, Lincoln and the Sheffield City Region; loss of facilities for military aircraft and royal helicopter flights which frequently refuel at the airport; the eviction and forced relocation of the Children's Air Ambulance; the loss of a substantial area of nationally, strategically important agricultural land; significant business impact on peripheral, non site based businesses which rely on trade from the airport; the provider of airborne sensing services that operates a fleet of 10 'special mission' equipped aircraft fulfilling UK government and European agency contracts for airborne intelligence, surveillance & reconnaissance and aerial survey work would probably have to close, due to the lack of suitable alternative accommodation; the European headquarters of a multinational company who have a reputation as world leaders in providing flight inspection, navigation, communication and calibration services for air transportation. Working with navigational aids, airfield lighting and communications equipment for civilian and military use and provision of real time passenger information for public transport operators would probably have to close, due to the lack of alternative suitable accommodation; the loss of business to the local area by the removal of services to Nottinghamshire Police, who use the site (between 12 to 15 times per annum) to deliver advanced driver training in tactical pursuit and containment; the loss of engagement with the wider community and schools to improve knowledge of Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics subjects and provision of educational activities such as flying experiences for local children. The implications of the Council's draft proposals for the closure of the airport have been poorly thought through and contradict several of their own long term goals and strategies for economic growth and job creation. There are several unused alternative 'brown field' ex-industrial areas within the near vicinity that are crying out for redevelopment.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP144	P Eaglen		Do not support the proposal for 2 new villages - would have a devastating and unacceptable impact on local and rural infrastructure. Major road improvements would be needed. The development of Bevercotes would be the most accepted as it is a brownfield site which could be redeveloped providing all the toxic waste is removed. The site is well screened, this should be retained, maintained and some area's improved. Major road improvements is a necessity. Gamston should not be developed - it is not all a brownfield site, a large part of it is agricultural and of reasonable quality. The airport provides employment for up to 100 people at 10 companies. Gamston Aviation Ltd have operated the site for over 41 years, the operation includes the airport manager, trained firefighters, aircraft refuelers and air traffic controllers all working on a shift system to support airfield operations 362 days per year, plus back office administration staff as well as other workers. The website shows that GAL has 50 to 250 employees and a turnover of 10 to 50 million. The Apron Cafe provides food and beverages for staff, aircraft and aviation related visitors and is very popular with a large number of non-aviation related local customers. All of the companies based at Gamston are high quality aviation services/ employment; if this was lost fail to see any new set up business being able to attract alternative skillful work. DEA Aviation Ltd operates and maintains a fleet of 10 "Special Mission" aircraft at Gamston Airport ~ http://www.diamond-air.at/en/special-mission-aircraft/ One of their primary roles is to provide Airborne ISR (Intelligence, Surveillance & Reconnaissance) services to the Government and European Agencies, some of which are related to national security. The global market for Airborne ISR was \$20 billion in 2018 but is expected to rise to over \$40 billion by 2020. DEA Aviation Ltd has invested heavily in its Gamston operations to be prepared to keep pace with the future growth potential within the Airborne ISR market. Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd provide flight inspection and validation services, navigational aids and communications equipment as well as airfield lighting systems, all to both civilian and military customers worldwide. Also the Children's Air Ambulance is based at Gamston. They have been provided with 24/7 access to the airport site and hangar security systems, have equipment available for getting the helicopter in and out of the hangar quickly and the provision of pilot controlled runway lights from the helicopter so it can be accessed and utilized very quickly to respond to emergencies. Being a helicopter it can depart and return at any time of day or night avoiding overflying the most built-up areas near to the airfield. The airport is also used by Nottinghamshire Police between 12 - 15 times per annum for driver training in Tactical Pursuit and Containment. The Plan does not properly or fully investigate, quantify or qualify the level of job losses resulting from the closure of the Airport or its negative impact on the local economy. The current figure show there is 2600 people unemployed plus recently Canute Haulage Ltd, with an operating base on the industrial area between Gamston Airport and the A1, and employing over 600 people within the group, which went into administration in December 2018. This will ultimately already leave a large industrial site vacant with the resultant job losses. Also the Plan has failed to quantify, or qualify the number and nature of businesses, and jobs that it intends to attempt to attract in order to support such extensive housing developments. Without which the developments will only serve to increase the large numbers commuting out of Bassetlaw on a daily basis and increase road congestion, traffic and noise pollution and provide little benefit to the local economy. The plan mentions that 17,000 people from Bassetlaw commute daily for work to Sheffield, Doncaster, Newark and the surrounding areas. Would strongly encourage the Council to look at the tangible benefits of preserving the Airport, to retain the existing businesses and employment but also for it to continue to provide a strategic resource to Bassetlaw to help attract new businesses to the area. Without a large influx of new businesses to provide employment for people locally then building thousands of new houses will vastly increase the number of commuters out of Bassetlaw providing a very limited contribution to the local economy. Should be noted that the site has at Land registry a Caution for either Chance Repair Liability or minerals.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP143	George Breed	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	The Plan is in total reliant upon both proposed garden village sites to deliver a total of 4000 homes. A promoter has an interest in the Bevercotes site however no developer interest as yet raising questions of the deliverability of the site. The supply of housing from either site is closely allied to their viability which is also unknown due to an absence of cost detail concerning necessary infrastructure (power/ services / diversion / energy / suitable roads etc). The Gamston Airport & Bevercotes Colliery were assessed along with other prospective garden village sites within the Bassetlaw New Settlement Study 2018. This set a series of tests to shortlist six sites that were subsequently examined further for suitability. One of the early tests identified the sustainability of parishes, drawing sites from the most sustainable for further examination. The test found Bevercotes colliery was unsustainable due to the absence of basic services i.e. retail, GP surgeries, schools or post office facility. Despite the council's own evidence Bevercotes has been brought forwards undermining the methodology behind the settlement study. The final assessment studied 'deliverability and viability' on three shortlisted sites and yet no detailed costing work is given on matters which directly affect the deliverability of these sites i.e. the costs attributable for major highway upgrades, service connections and upgrades, ground remediation cost, foundation strategies. Given the report concludes both Garden Villages are marginally viable without this information worry about the suitability of this particular spatial approach. Delivery of either village is subject to the cessation of an Airport business and the promoter's ability to find a willing developer(s) with the necessary capital to deliver significant frontloaded infrastructure cost, CIL and S106 contributions, build cost. The introduction of Garden Villages is a risky strategy to adopt. Ordinarily a council might consider the prospect of a single village enough risk for a Local Plan period. Two new villages is extremely risky - advise the 1000 completions anticipated be considered windfall completions and the additional 1000 homes re-distributed between the two principal towns of Workop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP146	L Gay		Why do it? Your report speaks of the "gentle undulations of lush green farmland" then claims it an "inefficient use of land". When forecasts for 2050 state 60% more food will be needed where is the logicity to build over the lushness? Your varying reports repeatedly speak of "green infrastructure" "air quality" "biodiversity" and every buzz word of the moment. It reports the requirement to "avoid inappropriate and unnecessary development in the countryside" so again why do it? Particularly as one of the supporting reports declares "protection & enhancement of open spaces in the District would help conserve & improve the visual amenity & existing character of Bassetlaw. The National Forecast for Bassetlaw is 5,000 extra but you have a figure of 6,630 required within the timeplan. Of course you have to be prepared but how far should that go? Your investigations have shown that Bassetlaw is basically a commuter area with a containment rate of 66.8% resident self-containment and a 69.6% workplace self-containment. This is lower than all surrounding areas which range between 70-85% for both types of self-containment. Comparing the Travel To Work Areas self-containment figures nationally shows that the Workop and Retford TTWA ranks 225th out of 228 TTWAs nationwide for resident self-containment and 218th out of 228 TTWAs for workplace self-containment. Why should Gamston go to build houses for people who will commute out of the district to work? The Plan waxes lyrical about providing for local employment but it also admits that "the industrial location of the A1 corridor is unproven". The Plan says "promoting economic prosperity through the delivery of high quality employment space and advanced communications technology" but B1, B2 and B8 doesn't say whether it is industrial or commercial which allows for a wide interpretation of what can be placed there. The supporting document commissioned by Bassetlaw, Economic Growth from a Garden Village, declares "It is considered unlikely that a garden village will act as a catalyst for a major inward investment" so again just what is hoped/intended to go there? It would be nice if the area of Retford could benefit from advanced technology first. The Plan states that new schools and health facilities will be provided. Has Nottinghamshire agreed it will provide new schools? If so and in what time scale? The secondary schools already in the area have a problem attracting staff, why will a new school have any more success? Has anybody told the NHS they will be providing brand new facilities when they are closing them? Has this been discussed with the relevant bodies? Refers to 6 Transport. Green infrastructure is a marvelous phrase but real life (and your supporting documents) disagree with the above declaration. "Connecting development to existing transport networks encourages the site to be accessible & may help reduce the need for further infrastructure in the District." Encourages, may help reduce; even your commissioned report isn't sure and why should existing infrastructure, already rocky, not be upgraded if money is available? Every new house will need (at least) two parking spaces per house so that's 625 parking spaces at Gamston and the area is a commuting one, so will mean 212 extra parking spaces somewhere. Being positive, they may all commute via Retford Station, will the parking be multi-storey? Cycle parking facility and links - The provision in the Retford area is a disgrace and downright dangerous in many places. A bit of a let down to discover cyclists in the District will only get decent provision when a couple of mega housing estates are built. "Overall it is considered that the development supported by the plan & resultant pressures associated with this level of development has the potential to result in habitat loss, disturbance & fragmentation. Sites by Gamston Airport (& former Bevercotes Colliery) would together provide a minimum of 1,000 new homes over the plan period & development at these locations has been identified as having potential to result in adverse impacts in this manner." "...expected to have negative effects on conserving the significance of settings of nearby heritage assets" Howabout "Gamston & Brickyard Road has been identified as containing land which has high tranquility. The provision of new development at these locations is likely to have an adverse impact on tranquility in the district. Maybe not as Green as the final booklet says and as "death and serious injury on the roads of Nottinghamshire is higher than average" should encouragement of so many extra car journeys really happen? Don't believe the extermination of Gamston will bring any benefit to Bassetlaw. The evidence supplied in the extensive documentation is rather flimsy and quite contrary. The infrastructure to support such a mammoth development is not there. Small country roads and B roads does not make for "good links", when they go through villages. Isolating so many families away from Retford and facilities will mean huge increases in car journeys with associated loss of air quality etc. There is no evidence to support that the NHS and associated bodies will fund infrastructure. Where are the shops-also mentioned-going to come from? Business rates are crippling existing shops so who will be setting up there? The nearest retail is the Co-op and Spar at Ordsall and parking, free movement of pedestrians is at bottleneck for hours in the day due to the estates already built around. Gamston is a huge asset to Bassetlaw to use as a tool to sell the area, not something that should become an eyesore from the A1. Garden Villages are currently a fashionable thought but what about the winner of the Wolfson Prize by David Rudlin who argued that existing towns should be expanded? When the brief was "How to create a garden city that would be visionary, economically viable and popular" to win with the totally opposite idea does indicate originality of thought.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP148	R Flounders	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	Refers to the planned growth for the garden villages. It acknowledges that delivery will continue beyond the plan period with 1,000 dwellings expected to come forward to 2035. The final sentence states that it is envisaged the delivery of the garden villages will help to meet a proportion of the needs of the local housing market in Retford, which has resulted in a lower housing target for that town. Object to this approach: the needs of the local housing market in Retford should be met in Retford, not in an outlying village. Support the identification of the garden villages in principle, their delivery as independent settlements with their own services and facilities, should not impact upon the growth of Retford as the second largest town in the District.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP148	R Flounders	ID Planning on behalf of Harron Homes	The two new garden villages are proposed to deliver 1,000 dwellings to the end of the plan period. It should be made clear that the delivery of dwellings in these villages will meet part of the housing requirement in Rural Bassetlaw, and not the town of Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP149	H Godley	Fisher German on behalf of D Thorlby	Largely support the proposed Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy, have serious concerns with the two garden villages as part of the strategy. The sustainability of this option is questioned. Do not consider the delivery of the two villages to be more sustainable then delivery in and adjoining existing settlements in Bassetlaw. The size of the proposed garden communities whilst considerable, would still lack the critical mass to deliver a range of services, facilities and amenities that other settlements such as Workop benefit from. Concerned that the location of the new villages, straddling either side of the A1, will lead it to becoming a dormitory community with residents heading straight onto the A1 to locations such as Doncaster and Newark daily for work. Such patterns are likely to lead to little benefit to the towns of Bassetlaw. Housing growth in the District's existing towns, such as Workop and Retford needs to be the focus of the strategy to stimulate growth and regeneration in those towns. The Garden Villages will not deliver these same benefits. A proportion of the 1,000 dwellings should be directed towards Workop to ensure it is delivering a quantum of development commensurate with housing need in the location and its sustainability credentials. If the Council proceeds, this should be seen as windfall, supporting the government in its aims of boosting significantly the supply of housing and contributing to housing delivery in the next Plan period. Not as a way to support the District's towns in their growth and regeneration.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP150	C Grainger		The two new garden villages is the best idea have heard since 1967 when the government created Milton Keynes. Would like to see this extended to three sites, Cottam power station is due to close this year - an ideal 3rd site has existing rail as well as road links. Being a brownfield site, it is suitable for both residential and commercial developments. The rail links to Retford would make it ideal for both residential and commercial making rail links to London in under 2 hours or even Eurostar to Paris etc. By granting it planning permission it would encourage EDF to clear the site as quickly as possible and create jobs that replaced the ones lost with its closure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP151	D Kitson	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	The Garden Villages are very close together and with the number of houses shown cumulatively it amounts to 4000 dwellings. This size of conurbation will rival the towns of Tuxford and Harworth and even Retford. The garden villages will have a negative effect on our remaining villages. Whether the Council allow our existing villages to continue to grow so that services can be maintained or they put an unduly tight cap on such development, but the dwellings in these new garden villages will be more affordable than those allocated in our existing villages. Land values in the garden villages will be considerably less than smaller sites in existing villages, this is simply a matter of scale. These new garden villages will be highly detrimental to the viability of our existing villages. Over the past 20+ years development in the majority of our villages has been small scale which has resulted in the loss of local services, such as schools, shops, public houses, churches etc. This was a conscious planning policy that has resulted in villages stagnating. Now with the advent of garden villages another more virulent problem will beset our existing villages and that will be unfair competition from these large villages. Question the term village - do not know a single village with house numbers approaching those suggested. These are towns and it remains to be seen if there will be sufficient jobs created within these sites for the residents. Doubt it. Like to know how these garden villages fit with the Council's own landscape assessments and the aims of the policies surrounding these assessments. These villages will have an irreversible negative effect on existing villages and village life. If families are not attracted into our villages, schools will not have the throughput of children required nor will the local facilities listed above last very long. This is based on historic facts of village life, only those villages with acceptable growth survive. This type of massive growth will take away the likelihood of developers looking at our existing villages as competition will be too steep and biased towards the new larger allocations. This will inevitably lead to a further reduction in rural services and possible closure of schools, shops etc. Not desirable in any way, after all there is a finite number of dwellings required to meet the demand identified. Garden villages are not required in Bassetlaw, just a more pragmatic approach to rural development in and around our existing villages. Retain Gamston airport and Bevercotes colliery site for employment- may get a major employer here being so close to the A1. Encouraging incentives should be offered nationwide and if the local authority do not have the experience to do so there are many in the district who have. These portions of land should not be given up to housing lightly, on the simple "all eggs in one basket" principle. This is idle planning and is not planning for the district as the detrimental effects do not seem to have been considered.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP152	P Robinson		Object to the plan to close Retford/Gamston Airport in order to use the site for development of a "Garden Village". To describe this as a "Brown Field" site in at best inaccurate. Among the several sound reasons this plan should be rejected is the fact that: It does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in NPPF paragraph 104f. The planners also do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP154	B & N Buddery		Para 12.9 of the Bassetlaw Draft Plan dismisses the high quality employment presently provided by Gamston Airport in a single sentence "Whilst development of the site would result in a loss of airport related employment, the new village would provide opportunities for new employment". Gamston currently provides employment to a significant number of people in specialist, highly skilled and well paid employment. DEA Aviation (https://www.dea.aero/) provide high tech aerial surveillance services to government and other agencies. They employ pilots, aerospace engineers, logistics planners, electronic and avionic engineers and other highly skilled people. Radiola Aerospace (http://www.radaero.com/) are a multi-national high-tech aviation company specialising in niche, but vital airport and air navigation services. Gemstone Aviation (https://gemstoneaviation.co.uk/) are an importer of the world's most advanced piston engine aircraft. There are other companies operating on the airfield that also provide high quality employment. To dismiss these in one sentence with the argument that 'there will be other jobs' seems to be a rather cavalier approach, lacking in rigour and depth. Nothing in the proposals address where these highly skilled residents of Bassetlaw will find further employment should their employers be forced to shut down or re-locate. The NPPF definition of a brownfield site covers any land that has had, or currently has, a building or permanent structure on it, with only some exceptions. This is an extremely broad definition that the Council For The Protection of Rural England is challenging. The publicly accepted view of a brownfield site is one that is disused. Gamston Airport is definitely not disused. It supports a thriving community of businesses, private flyers, aviation enthusiasts and a large number of visitors. The Plan dismisses this in a single sentence in Para 12.10 "The present site is considered to be an inefficient use of land..." There is no quantifiable justification provided to support this. The development of two large new developments will require significant investment in roads and infrastructure. This will inevitably impact upon the surrounding villages. The Plan extols the benefits of the short commute into London by rail from Retford, the routes to Retford station and the parking once there are woefully inadequate. Any increase in numbers using the station to commute will require significant redevelopment within Retford town centre itself which the Plan has disregarded. Commuters using the A1 from the new developments will also increase congestion on an already congested bottleneck on that major traffic artery. Current schools in the area would not be able to accommodate the increased numbers of children. Whilst this is addressed in Para 12.30, it is not clear how these will be funded and maintained. On a wider view, developments of the proposed site would almost inevitably swamp and subsume the surrounding towns and villages of Gamston, Elkesley, East Markham, Tuxford, Bothamsall and others. This has not been addressed. Draw your attention to the Governments Aviation Policy Framework (assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/153776/aviation-policy-framework.pdf). Para. 1.3 states that "there is broad agreement that aviation benefits the UK economy....the economic benefits are significant....." and that "In addition, we believe there to be social and cultural benefits from aviation". This government policy appears to have either been ignored deliberately or dismissed without due process.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP158	H Godley	Fisher German on behalf of T Strawson and D Horrocks	Largely support the proposed Spatial Strategy, have serious concerns with the promotion of two garden villages as part of the strategy. The sustainability of this option is questioned. Do not consider the delivery of two villages to be more sustainable than delivery in and adjoining existing settlements in Bassetlaw. The size of the proposed garden community sites whilst considerable, would still lack the critical mass to deliver a range of services, facilities and amenities that other settlements such as Retford benefit from. Concerned that the location of the proposed new villages, straddling either side of the A1, will lead it to becoming a dormitory community with residents heading straight onto the A1 towards locations such as Doncaster and Newark daily for work. Such patterns are likely to lead to little benefit to the towns of Bassetlaw. Housing growth in the District's existing towns, such as Retford and Worksoop needs to be the focus of the strategy to stimulate growth and regeneration in those towns. The Garden Villages will not deliver these same benefits. A significant proportion of the 1,000 dwellings should be directed towards Retford to ensure it is delivering a quantum of development commensurate with housing need in the location and its sustainability credentials. If the Council proceeds with the Garden Villages, this should be seen as windfall, supporting the government in its aims of boosting significantly the supply of housing in the next Plan Period. Not as a way to support the District's towns in their growth and regeneration.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP159	P Mitchell		Makes many referrals to Plans "that will" etc when the wording should be "they would" etc. This choice of phraseology leads to the opinion that this is a 'done deal' and the Consultation is purely a PR Exercise. This is more evident when some of the detail is examined, with conflicting statements and referrals, and dismissal of existing High Level Jobs as being expendable. Distances quoted in the ADAS Report Section 4.6 appear to be inaccurate and seem to be taken as direct routes, or 'as the crow flies'. Examples are those relating to the Bevercotes: Bevercotes to Tuxford is stated as being 3.9km. Road distance is 8.4km. Has this Report assumed access through Bevercotes ?? The Lane from the former Pit Site towards Tuxford IS A PRIVATE ROAD. Bevercotes to Retford is stated as being 6.82km. Road distance is 11.5km. Bevercotes to Retford Oaks Academy is stated as 7.0km. Road Distance is nearer 11.5km. Bevercotes to Elkesley Primary School is stated as a 'round trip' of 4.4km. The road journey is a 9.4km 'round trip'. The road distance is 4.4km to and 5km back as it is necessary to use the "new" Elkesley Bridge on the return journey. Accessing the A1 Northbound at Twyford Bridge really is a case of 'taking one's life in one's hands' due to the poor slip road length and speed of A1 Traffic. The need for the Housing is not clear and appears to be based on a 'directive' rather than a true requirement. There are a large number of empty properties in Bassetlaw totalling around 1,300 (Report from "Action on Empty Homes" September 2018) the requirement for these new properties seems a little exaggerated. It looks more like development for developments sake. The decisions made to compel Parishes to take housing development do not concur with the requirement through other sources/channels to reduce our 'Carbon Footprint' by making less car journeys. This has a similarity to the proposals for two "Garden Villages" (a strange term for small towns) located away from the main Hubs of Shops, Markets, Entertainment and Services requiring travel along existing Roads that, at times, are inadequate for the current traffic levels. Apart from the additions to the 'Carbon Footprint' that this will create. Locating this housing adjacent to existing urban areas. To this needs to be added the traffic created by the new residents 'commuting' to places of work (e.g. Sheffield, Rotherham, Doncaster, Worksoop, Retford, Lincoln) and even those who wish to use the Rail Network will find that access to the Station in Retford at peak times is extremely difficult, due to current congestion, and the Station itself has inadequate parking facilities for a much increased usage. A better proposal would be to have these developments in close proximity to Public Transport Links that would allow for a reduction in car travel for Social and Work. It is commendable that there is Industrial/Commercial Land, this needs to be for true employment. Warehousing and Distribution Depots are becoming more automated and jobs created are smaller than in Manufacturing. These jobs are not of 'high-tech,' attracting the higher paid employee that raises the level of the Job Market and the Income Level. It is not acceptable that highly technical jobs are wiped out to be replaced by Automated Warehouses with minimal labour requirements or low-paid job opportunities. The proposal to destroy current businesses on Gamston (around 100 companies with known or suspected pollution including soil contamination due to hazardous waste. [Gamston Airfield is in use having 10 Companies related to the Aviation Industry with around 100 employees in skilled high-tech. jobs raising the level of the economy in this area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP159	P Mitchell		The current road network is, at times, beyond its capacity to cope without additional vehicles trying to get from out-of-town locations to local centres for Work, Access to the Rail Network, Social Activities, Shopping etc. Gamston has issues at the river bridge and the A638 to Retford has recently had 'Speed Cameras' fitted following fatal accidents. The A638 is also a 'bottleneck into Retford. The B6387 is a Rural Road currently carrying traffic in excess of what it was designed for, a large amount of which is slow moving agricultural traffic. This then approaches Bothamsall or Walesby both villages will be affected by increases in traffic. Bothamsall have a narrow road with many bends and narrow pavements. The village should also be protected by a "7.5 tonne Weight Restriction" which is flouted. Despite the difficulties of passage there is, on average, a computed vehicle usage of around 3,000 vehicles PER DAY at current levels. This would only increase if developments go ahead. Road improvements would not be implemented in the early stages, and Highways is outwith the remit of the Council. Before Bothamsall could take more housing the Sewage Authority (Severn Trent) would need to take actions with the Pumping Station on Main Street. In times of heavy rainfall it is not unusual to have this Facility overflow to the point where we have experienced sewage flooding over the road Development of these sites is planned over a period of time. As such, the infrastructure of Shops, Schools, Employment Units, etc as proposed is unlikely to occur until well into the development. Apart from the industrial applications other aspects are Flying Lessons and Pleasure, Pilot Training, a Catering Facility, and support for a Children's Air Ambulance. All essential activities not to be lightly discarded. In the early stages there will not be any provision for Schools, which are, not within the remit of the Council. This will then put additional pressure on local educational facilities. Are these other facilities able to cope, which cannot be determined as the occupants are not known yet and how many places will be required? These facilities will entail travel adding to the congestion and pollution created by these 'school runs'. Again a outside the control or remit of the Council is health which will only follow when sufficient occupation of houses is taken up, if it is allowed to happen. Gamston Airport is set amongst good quality farmland. This land is definitely needed for food production. Home grown Food will become a priority to reduce imports. On the Airfield and in close proximity (within the woodlands) the wildlife and natural environment succeeds. It is well known that wildlife moves away from developed areas due to the unnatural disturbance of their habitats and by human disturbances after the development. Bevercotes Pit Site is almost enclosed by woodland which is acting as a screen to the surrounding area and has a 'carbon absorbing' effect. The lane through to Bevercotes Hall and Bevercotes Village is a private road, giving only one 'official' access road. If this part of the Plan is to proceed then the screening is still vital to act as 'carbon-absorbing'. Development at either or both Sites would create more traffic in an easterly direction. The 'direct' route, to Mansfield-Chesterfield-M is through Bothamsall. This is evidenced by the recordings that show traffic flows of around 3,000 vehicles PER DAY through this small village with a narrow Main Street, narrow Pavements, and several Bends. Buildings in Bothamsall can be felt to vibrate when traffic passes through now, so additional traffic will only make this worse with building damage a high possibility. Bevercotes Pit Site will be extremely expensive to develop for housing as the former use will have left much contamination. This would result in much lower CIL payments. It appears to not have attracted any interest as a Warehouse Development, but are there any reasons known for this ?? It should be developed for alternative Industrial/Commercial applications. It would create much additional traffic through the villages of Gamston, Walesby and Bothamsall, and Ollerton Town, creating pollution and congestion. If this Site is developed for Housing or Industrial/Commercial strict traffic controls need to be requested from NCC to protect the small villages from the extra traffic involved in Construction and then occupation. Some thought should be given to restoring the Rail Link to this site for 'spoil' removal and materials delivery. It could then be developed to offer a passenger service. The traffic flow needs to be diverted away from Bothamsall, by ensuring that Construction Traffic does not pass through here and that as soon as any development is approved there needs to be a route direct to the A614 avoiding Bothamsall. A large amount of traffic cuts through here to avoid the delays in Ollerton. This can only be expected to get worse.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP159	P Mitchell		Refers to Section 3.2 Results of the Bassetlaw New Settlement Study Methodology relative to Gamston Airport. It is most disturbing that the loss of employment is passed off so flippantly without any corroborating evidence or supporting statement of facts as to how many jobs would be lost or what businesses would be affected. And in a similar tone within Policy Statement 12.9 of the Plan it is stated: "Whilst development of the site would result in a loss of airport related employment the new village would provide opportunities for new employment" There is no attempt to quantify the job losses, or potential gains, from any redevelopment. How many of the planning department have visited to find out what happens there? How many of the elected members and Planning Committee members have visited? It is not just about a handful of jobs but 10 businesses that could be forced to close because they are all aviation industry related companies. Provides list of the businesses operating on the airport site. The first 2 have direct employees of the current owner, Gamston Aviation Ltd. The rest are independent companies who have invested to start the businesses and grow them but also the funding of investments in both on-site infrastructure and aircraft. Gamston Airport includes the airport manager, trained firefighters, aircraft refuelers and air traffic controllers to support airfield operations 362 days per year, plus administration staff as well as cleaners. The Apron Cafe ~ providing food and beverages not only for staff, aircrew and visitors. DEA Aviation Ltd ~ Operate & maintain a fleet of 10 "special mission" equipped aircraft out of Gamston Airport fulfilling Government and European Agency contracts for Airborne ISR amongst other activities. Gamston Flying School ~ Aircraft pilot training to, and for, EASA standards and qualifications, Trial Flying Lessons and Aircraft Rental. mContrail Flight Services Ltd ~ ground handling services for visiting business aircraft, passengers & pilots. They also operate aircraft for the Pektron Group Ltd who have 3 aircraft based at Gamston. Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd ~ providing Flight Inspection and Calibration services, Navigational Aids and Communications equipment, all for both civilian and military use, as well as airfield lighting systems. mkuki Helicopters ~ Helicopter pilot training to EASA standards & helicopter sales. ALH Skytrain ~ Aircraft pilot training to, and for, EASA standards and qualifications. True Airsteep Flight Training ~ Ground school flight training & Examination to EASA standards. Gamston Flight Training ~ Aircraft pilot training to, and for, EASA standards and qualifications, plus Aircraft Charter Reach Aerospace ~ Aircraft Management, Sales & Contract Maintenance Gemstone Aviation Ltd ~ recently appointed UK & Eire distributor for Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH of Austria None of these businesses can relocate to a business park that may never be built as they all require to operate from an airfield. DEA Aviation Ltd and Radiola Aerospace two very high-tech companies based on the airport site along with the resultant loss of high-tech jobs within the area and overall loss to the local economy. Dukeries Aviation Ltd based at Netherthorpe near Worksoop, provide aircraft maintenance and carry out Civil Aviation Authority licensed annual aircraft safety and integrity inspections on a high proportion of the Gamston based aircraft. They also provide, and support, some of the aircraft used by flight training schools at Gamston Airport. Pektron Group Ltd is industrial electronics design, validation and manufacture and count major corporates on the scale of JCB, Ford and Nissan as customers. One of the Children's Air Ambulance helicopters is based at Gamston Airport. They have been provided with 24/7 access to the airport site and hangar security systems, have equipment available for getting the helicopter in and out of the hangar quickly and the provision of pilot controlled runway lights from the helicopter so it can be accessed and utilised very quickly. There is 100 jobs that will be lost with 10 separate independent businesses potentially having to be wound up in addition to Gamston Aviation Ltd, and Dukeries Aviation Ltd, that will have its business severely adversely affected. The airport is also utilised by Nottinghamshire Police between 12 and 15 times per annum for driver training in TPAC. Canute Haulage Ltd, with an operating base on the industrial area between Gamston Airport and the A1, and employing over 600 people within the group, went into administration in December 2018. That will ultimately already leave a large industrial site vacant and with the resultant job losses. The loss of aviation-dependent businesses and development totally contradicts and ignores the Visions & Objectives 4 and 6 of the draft plan. The draft plan mentions that 17,000 people from Bassetlaw commute daily to Sheffield, Doncaster, Newark and the surrounding areas. Strongly encourage the Council to look at all the tangible benefits of preserving Gamston Airport, not only to retain the existing businesses and employment but also for it to continue to provide a strategic resource to Bassetlaw to help attract new businesses to the area. Without a large influx of new businesses to provide employment for people locally then building new houses will increase the number of commuters providing a very limited contribution to the local economy as well as creating more road traffic and so mitigating any efforts made to reduce carbon emissions and limit the environmental impact.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP159	P Mitchell		Para 3.2 states that: "In order for the Bassetlaw Plan to be successfully developed and adopted, it will need to be in conformity with the NPPF" but has failed to provide any mention of, and no consideration to, its statutory duty under Section 9, Paragraph 104(f) of the NPPF which requires that Planning Policies should: "recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy." Suggest look more closely at the Government's General Aviation Strategy and also the information that is readily available on the web site of the All Party Parliamentary Group for General Aviation especially the Airfields Working Group. Should you take the time to adequately research what you are proposing with the closure and redevelopment of Gamston Airport then you will discover that two of the fundamental issues that the APPG are working hard to address are those of adequate and cost-effective pilot training within the UK and the fact that aviation is at the heart of high-tech jobs and skills and so is promoting STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics) jobs through General Aviation. Boeing predict, as part of their business modelling, that an additional 800,000 pilots will be required worldwide within the next 20 years. Because of a more advantageous tax regime towards flight training in such as Spain, and a much more proactive approach to General Aviation in the USA, a high proportion of pilot training is already being drawn outside of the UK which needs to be addressed. There is also a national shortage of flying instructors as well as pilots and yet the Plan, will wipe out 5 pilot / flight training schools. These cannot simply be relocated because they require an airfield and other airfields have established flying training schools.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP159	P Mitchell		It is an active airport for business, leisure, flight training and Children's Air Ambulance, home to 10 independent aviation related businesses, providing employment for around 100 people, training facilities for emergency services as well as having a large acreage of productive arable agricultural land then how can it be possibly be deemed to be an "inefficient use of land" (12.10 of draft plan) as Bassetlaw Council is claiming?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more
DBLP159	P Mitchell		It is very disappointing that the provisions of what is seen by most to be flawed legislation that allows a wider airfield / airport site, irrespective of its additional use as grazing or arable land, to be considered in its entirety as 'brownfield'. Brownfield land is a term used in urban planning to describe any previously developed land that is not currently in use, whether contaminated or not. This Site is definitely currently in use!! Natural England are a statutory consultee on plans that are likely to cause the loss of 20 hectares or more of BMV (Best & Most Versatile) land. Have calculated that there is 96 hectares (238 acres) of land in continual use, within the wider Gamston Airport site, for productive arable farming. The NPPF states that: "Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality." The Agricultural Land Classification maps are of a scale that do not allow for assessment of individual fields, the ALC map for the East Midlands shows that the agricultural land at Gamston Airport site to be a mix of Grade 2 and 3. Having contacted Natural England note with interest and disappointment that the Council has consulted Natural England but not so that their comments were be available before the Draft Plan was published.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP159	P Mitchell		Refers to precedents for retaining the airport. Wellesbourne Airfield, Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airfield, Redhill Airfield, Reigate & Banstead Borough Council, Welshpool, Powys, Sowell Aerodrome, Northamptonshire. All are thriving local airports used for business and leisure but which also serves the local, and area, community. With the right airport management, and with the right local authority attitude then General Aviation airfields can, and do, thrive and provide numerous advantages to the local existing business community as well as providing a wide range of jobs from catering to high-tech airframe and avionics engineers.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP160	M Lynam		Based upon the calculations in the 2018 Rural Settlement Study, Clayworth is proposed to have a minimum of 14 houses and a maximum of 28 houses during the plan period. This is based upon an overall projected housing requirement across the District, which has been allocated proportionally across all settlements identified as 'suitable for growth' based upon their current housing numbers. Whilst this would appear a fair and equitable way of allocating the projected housing requirements, there will be a need to consider how this number needs to be flexed as part of the next stage of the plan process to reflect the following key issues: - The ability of other settlements across the District to accommodate greater than their minimum required housing allocation; - The availability of suitable sites in the village; - The specific character of the village; - that Clayworth is not on the main highways route network. As part of the next stage of the plan process, it is expected that the minimum housing requirement will be exceeded in several larger settlements, which will be able to accommodate greater housing growth due to their proximity to services and availability of suitable housing sites. Should consider and explain how they will reflect the need to accept lower than the minimum housing requirements in other, predominantly smaller and less well served, settlements i.e. how they will decide which settlements can accept lower housing unit targets. Would strongly advise that despite the Rural Settlement Study and the Plan not using either a settlement's conservation status nor its availability/proximity to services as an initial filtering criterion (due to the Council recognising such an approach would be unsound at this stage), serious consideration is given to reintroducing them at this more advanced stage, to prioritise which settlements could see their housing numbers reduced. Given Clayworth's 'enhanced' conservation status and its lack of basic services, either in the village or in any reasonable proximity, it should be prioritised for lower housing requirements. Understood why the Council has chosen not to fit settlements suitable for growth at this stage based upon their conservation status, not least given the District has 32 conservation areas. But simply relying on Policy 8 or 21 to protect both the rural and conservation status of Clayworth in respect to the type of development considered, the Council considers prioritising reductions in housing numbers for these type of settlements during the plan making process. This is of relevance to Clayworth as its conservation status is 'enhanced' beyond the normal narrow confines of the built settlement. Clayworth's status also includes the way the village sits within the wider environment. This puts a greater need for consideration to be given to how development affects the way the village appears from a wider perspective, and not just ensuring development is consistent with the built character of the village. This warrants serious and careful consideration when sites are being reviewed as part of the next phase of the plan process. Not least as it appears entirely consistent with Policy 8 Criteria C which states that any development should 'not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside and farmland.' It has been suggested that previous sites identified as part of the 2017 LAA will be considered. This identified 5 sites in Clayworth, all of which were not considered further, as at that time, the previous Local Plan did not identify the village as suitable for growth. The Council should clarify, at an early stage, whether the 2017 LAA is still valid and its status in respect to the next stage of this new plan process. Welcome Policy 8 which seeks to protect a number of features of rural settlements. The proposals for the strategic criteria in this policy are robust which is encouraging. Prior to these policies being used to protect the rural nature of settlements, the next stage of identifying suitable sites should also consider the criteria set out in Policy 8 to avoid unsuitable sites proceeding further. This is of concern to Clayworth. As Policy 8 outlines, that any development should be 'of a scale and in a location that is in keeping with the core shape and form of the settlement and will not adversely harm its character and appearance', and also that 'it would not result in the loss of identified open spaces within the settlement that contributes to the character and form of the settlement'. Three of the five sites previously identified in 2017 contravene this policy. These are: LAA255, LAA265 and LAA266 – Clayworth does not contain any significant housing developments which would be considered homogenous in form and character i.e. housing estates or homes built en-mass at the same time. This site would be large enough to accommodate a significant number of housing units, therefore making it entirely inconsistent with the form and character of the existing settlement. It would appear unlikely that Clayworth would have suitable sites to accommodate even the minimum proposed housing requirement of 14 units, without contravening Policy 8. Would expect the Council applies Policy 8 and 21 rather than relying on them to protect settlements from unsuitable development post-allocation. Welcome in Policy 8 that 'new housing will also be supported within settlements and/or on nonallocated sites where appropriate to the character of the area, and where amenity or highway safety is not adversely affected.' Clayworth is served by only a single B road (B1403) which runs from Hayton through the village then up to Gringley on the Hill, alongside an unclassified road from Drakeholes through the village to Wheatley. 14 new dwellings would add significant pressure on the road network, in and surrounding Clayworth, which it is unable to accommodate. This should be considered as part of the site allocation process, but also to prioritise Clayworth as a settlement whose minimum housing requirement should be reduced subject to other settlements exceeding theirs.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP161	J Whaley-Baldwin		Express my strong objection as the Plan will have an irreversibly destructive effect on the diverse community of individuals and organisations that depend upon Gamston Airport. It is clear that the council's intention to build on the site is supported by misinformed and incorrect belief that the services and facilities can be simply dispensed with or easily replaced. The Plan also demonstrates an irresponsible and inconsiderate approach to the employment of those who work at the airport, erroneously assuming that these jobs can be easily replaced by misunderstanding the highly specific and demanding technical nature of the roles. As a medium-sized and very well equipped, internationally-connected General Aviation (GA) airport, capable of handling aircraft ranging from light aircraft to small jets by both night and day, and providing flight instruction in both fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters from an amateur to a professional level through numerous on-site organisations, Gamston Airport is, and will remain to be, an irreplaceable East-Midlands asset. Gamston does, and will continue to provide a valuable transport link connecting the East Midlands to the rest of the UK and Europe in ways that Doncaster-Sheffield and Nottingham-East Midlands Airport do not provide. General Aviation flight usage by business personnel both to-and-from all corners of the UK and Europe, especially to areas served only by smaller airports that are not accommodated for by airlines operating out of larger airports, is commonplace. If Gamston is to be removed, where will these aircraft be based, and how will these links be replaced? The plan does not address this issue at all, choosing instead to focus only upon local bus and train routes. There are three tiers of airport in the UK: Small airfields hosting mainly hobby pilots, medium-sized airports supporting activities ranging from flying training (including professional pilot training), aircraft engineering and charter flights, to large-scale international airports such as East-Midlands airport. Gamston Airport belongs to the middle tier, and it is in-fact this tier that offers the largest variety of commercial enterprise. The middle tier is the only one capable of hosting small jets at a reasonable price; the majority of business aircraft chose to land at mid-tier airports since their landing, handling and parking fees are vastly reduced in comparison to the larger airports. The loss of Gamston will force these aircraft elsewhere, which drives more business in the direction of larger airports and away from smaller ones, allowing such large aerodromes to raise prices, and contributing to a serious shortage of reasonable, medium-sized useable airports for the UK GA sector. The indispensable value of Gamston Airport is illustrated by my own usage of the airport; as a Cambridge University student, I drive over 120 miles - at significant time and fuel cost to myself - to be able to fly from the airport, passing at least five other airfields, because there is nowhere else able to provide the flexibility and variety of services offered by Gamston. Further, my home address is in Belper, Derbyshire. Despite having at least four airfields and airports closer than Gamston (including East Midlands Airport) still make the drive to Gamston because it offers facilities that cannot be found elsewhere. Intend to begin part of my commercial pilot training at Gamston – more specifically to undertake my EASA competency-based Instrument Rating (IR) – a process which will be more difficult if Gamston is to be removed. This would be devastating for those pilots who rely on Gamston for their commercial aviation careers. Gamston is a hive of STEM activity; observations that cannot be made nor appreciated by those not experienced/involved in the sector. The airport significantly boosts the cultural intellectuality of the area and that its existence proudly stands out in a region not otherwise noted for its technological offerings. It is woefully misinformed and borderline offensive that the Plan states 7. Whilst development of the site would result in a loss of airport related employment, the new village would provide opportunities for new employment. It is abundantly clear that these highly technical roles cannot in any reasonable capacity be replaced with 'alternative employment' in the garden village. What possible employment could aircraft engineers, tower operators, flight instructors, flight charterers feasibly seek in the garden village? Is the garden village going to offer aircraft engineering, flight instruction and character flight services? Many of the businesses at Gamston built themselves up from scratch, and depend on the airport to survive, and cannot be operated outside of an airport environment. Moreover, where are the people that require these services expected to go? The GA sector in the UK is an intricate and complex machine, comprising over 96% of the aviation operations in the United Kingdom, and contributes billions of pounds to the UK economy annually. Understanding of the magnitude and ubiquity of the UK's GA sector is inadequate; the most striking evidence of this being 'aviation' is used just once in the Local Plan (page 91). In comparison p 90 describes Gamston as a 'small scale, commercial enterprise', despite having five active flying schools, being the British and Irish distributor for the multi-million Euro Diamond Aircraft Industries (Austria), and hosting numerous aircraft engineering and charter flight services. Urge the council to employ a truly competent and informed consultative body that, instead of trying to justify the proposed building on the airport site, approaches from the opposite direction, and determines whether the price of permanently removing an irreplaceable jewel in our country's aviation sector is really worth the construction of a garden village that can be placed in less harmful locations. It is detailed when it comes to describing should be built, but lacks detail and understanding, when it comes to explaining the void in aviation facilities will be replaced. This is in contrast to the NPPF 2019, which states that planning policies should: 5. recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency services.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP164	D Suter		This is an objection to the Local Plan. Understand and agree with the more housing being built to support the demand in the local area. Do not agree with the proposal to build upon Retford, Gamston Airport. General aviation is a huge sector in the UK that is under-funded, under-appreciated and poorly represented across the country. It has such a large influence on not just free movement in the UK, but the entire airline industry. It's becoming harder and harder to find pilots, and with the demand for more flights, the grassroots process to allow people to train in their relatively 'local' area is getting harder. Come from a low wealth family and have had little support in terms of funding to achieve my lifelong dream of becoming a pilot. As more airports shut down, prices and distances to an airport where I can learn to fly increase. As demand for airline pilots increases, the demand for instructors increases. As the demand for general aviation airports increases. With the supply of general aviation airports decreasing and the number of instructors decreasing, the price of learning to fly increases. As a result, less people (particularly people from an under-privileged background) can learn to fly - hence the harder it is for people like myself to achieve the job that I dream to do, not because of my competence or skill, but because airports like Retford, Gamston Airport are being forced to close as they are poorly represented and under-recognised for the impact they have the UK economy and local areas.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP166	Mr & Mrs Robinson		The proposed plan will create more traffic on the B6387 through Gamston on MuttonshireHill / Rectory Lane which includes Hather Close to the A638 Gt North Road. Hather Close occupants are all senior citizens, do they really need to put up with more traffic. If Commercial units are built how will the B6387 through Gamston cope, is not a good road for HGV traffic now so what will it be like. The volume of traffic including HGV's is quite busy during peak times now, so the extra traffic will be worse than ever, traffic from the A1 already cuts through Gamston. By all means build new houses but please give them a new access road to A638, surely a new road round the airfield can be made to access A638	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP167	A Clarke		Objections to the draft local plan, specifically in relation to the proposed housing development at Retford (Gamston) Airport. The plan underestimates the loss of highly skilled jobs at the Airport and that jobs in the proposed garden village will be low skilled and consequently lower paid. The area needs highly skilled, diverse jobs, that broaden rather than narrow the skill set of the district. Small general aviation airports help divert concentrations of traffic and environmental issues around larger airports. Retford (Gamston) Airport is part of a nationally important aviation infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP168	M Leusby		Find it hard to believe that closure of an active, vibrant airfield (with recent investment in structure and hangarage) can even be considered. The number of available airfields to feed the very necessary GA structure of UK has reduced considerably in recent years and once they are gone, they will never be replaced. The APPG is working towards defence of this situation – so why would you fly in the face of our elected representatives (the largest cross-party group in Parliament!)? There must be other sites that you could consider without the loss of so many jobs and businesses – which will be lost forever to your area. Suffice to say that you would destroy another facility from which potentially life-saving organisations such as ours are able to operate from. Don't do it!	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP169	I Herring	Avant Homes (Central) and Wyndthorpe Developments Ltd	The contribution from the two garden villages toward the overall planned housing supply is estimated at 1,000 units in the plan period. The draft evidence base contains a New Settlement Study which explores the feasibility of various options, little evidence is available in the public domain by which to substantiate the Council's assumptions on deliverability. Welcome a review of the Council's Local Plan housing trajectory at the earliest opportunity, together with any evidence to support the deliverability of both sites. Flexibility in the overall plan requirement is essential in order to offset any potential slippage in delivery. In our experience, large scale new settlements or sustainable urban extensions ('SUE's) are commonly susceptible to delays in bringing forward first completions, not least due to the complexities of facilitating initial upfront infrastructure to bring sites to a point by which preferred developers may be appointed to submit detailed planning applications. Due to the significant upfront costs associated, initial planning applications are typically frontloaded with a volume of viability work, often resulting in protracted delays in agreeing Section 106 Agreements and associated trigger points. It is anticipated that in the case of both planned settlements, the affordable housing policy aspirations will be challenging to meet in full and given the Council's admission as to the achievability of delivering 134 affordable homes per annum, the Authority may wish to give consideration to wider Local Plan objectives. The ADAS Bassettlaw New Settlement Study (April 2018) provides a series of high-level assumptions in order to viability test each site. Whilst useful as a broad exercise, the paper is not clear as to what specific inputs have been assumed, including sales revenues and any S106 requirements inclusive of affordable housing delivery. There is no confirmation that M4(2) and M4(3) standards have been factored into build cost assumptions. In the case of Bevercotes, it is noted that initial viability assumptions already generate a below market return of circa £150k per acre, exclusive of incorporating these points. In the case of both planned settlements, the majority of delivery is envisaged beyond the plan period (i.e. 2035 onward). Whilst both new settlements have potential to contribute toward meeting the District's housing needs in later years, this should not be at the short term expense of providing much needed homes to more sustainable locations. With respect to Gamston Airport, the Bassettlaw New Settlement Study references the land being controlled by 2 separate landowners, however the paper is ambiguous as to whether an alternative residential use would provide an incentive to release the land for development. The report concludes that:- "Whether at this level of residual land value this would encourage the existing landowners to close down the existing use and make the land available for development is unclear without undertaking further direct consultation with them." Further work should be undertaken to ascertain the viability and deliverability of both sites and in the case of Gamston Airport, the Council should be clear as to the landowner's intentions to release the site for mixed use development.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP170	M Malcolm	East Markham Parish Council	Given their proximity to the A1 corridor both of the sites should remain as industrial and not be reclassified as housing. There is a lack of employment opportunities in rural South East Bassetlaw and their connectivity to the A1 and A57 mean these two sites offer the widest possibilities for industrial use. Gamston Airport has the ability to connect the A1 via both the B6397 and the new bridge at Jockey House lane and given careful planning it should be possible to keep the runway open for use. Understand this type of development has taken place at Gloucester Airport. Gamston Airport provides over 100 jobs, most of them highly skilled in aircraft repair and maintenance, these jobs would be lost should the airport close. Jobs of this skill and calibre will be hard to replace in the area. The airport is the only private airport in Nottinghamshire, and provides a range of facilities for small aircraft associated with business use and a useful leisure facility for light aircraft enthusiasts. Understand that the A1 junction at Twyford Bridge is of concern regarding its use by heavy goods vehicles, and would suggest that if both sites were developed for industrial use this would enable the contribution required towards upgrading to be shared. The District Council could contribute to the upgrading from CIL monies. Alternatively, could put the bridge forward with other initiatives in the District seeking a share in the Government's £1.6 bn as seed money to help the economic development. Should the housing plan continue, the implications for the surrounding parishes would be considerable. Construction traffic associated with a development of this magnitude would be considerable, the B6397 is a minor country road and the two curves in Gamston village will require considerable upgrading prior to the commencement of construction. When the new villages begin to be occupied there will be an increased amount of traffic, in the vicinity but on Retford itself, (Retford grinds to a halt every time the A1 closes, regular extra traffic could cause this situation on a regular basis) with extra traffic caused by people leaving for employment, the school run, shopping and leisure. Concerned that this development will put an intolerable strain on all the infrastructure services (transport, education, medical etc) in our area. Will need to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place i.e. Retail facilities, Schools, Doctors Surgery, Community/Sports facilities prior to the commencement of house building. By ensuring these facilities are in place prior the housing phase it could alleviate many of traffic problems. An alternative would be to utilise Bevercotes as a garden village and utilise the Airport for airport and employment, like Gloucester Airport, utilising Jockey House Lane and the new bridge for access to the A1, which could still go ahead if the bridge improvement was delayed.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP174	R Hill		Does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in the NPPF paragraph 104f. Do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. Para 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport contradict para 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create. Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance. The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6. Makes a case for local housing need in Worksop but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. States that Retford has experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, without the need to destroy existing infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP181	D Hicks		Please don't close Gamston airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP182	D Bramley	Severn Trent Water Ltd	The proposed sites are located remotely from any significant existing sewerage infrastructure, off site works will be required to make a connection. Based on our high level assessments a connection into the current drainage system is likely to result in an increase in flood risk and increase spill volumes at overflow locations. A revised assessment will need to be undertaken once further details of the development are available. It is anticipated that the provision of a new settlement will result in a master plan - would strongly encourage further discussions around the development of these villages with Severn Trent to enable an understanding of the development phasing, and delivery / occupation timelines so that a plan can be developed for what infrastructure will be needed and when it will need to be provided.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP184	M Speck	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Do not support the allocation of the former Bevercotes Colliery site due to its designation as a Local Wildlife Site (LWS). There are three Local Wildlife Sites in and adjacent to the proposed allocation: Bevercotes Colliery Site (LWS 5/2165); Bevercotes Colliery Site and Lawn Covert (LWS 5/304); Fox Covert West Drayton (LWS 5/3411). Local Wildlife Sites are afforded protection due to their substantive nature conservation value. Their selection takes into consideration the most important, distinctive and threatened species and habitats in a national, regional and local context, making them some of our most valuable urban and rural wildlife areas. Local authorities in England and Wales have a key role to play in the conservation of biodiversity and this is now recognised and formalised in Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006, where: "Every public body must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity". 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 The Act. The habitat in the former Bevercotes Colliery site is included on the list as Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP184	M Speck	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	The statement in Section 8 seems incongruous with Policy 12. Do not see how the mitigation hierarchy can be applied appropriately i.e. avoid damage for example, if a site has already been allocated in principal. If this is to be strictly applied, then another site would need to be chosen. The whole of the site is currently a Local Wildlife Site and has existing nature conservation value of at least a county level. Question whether delivery of a net gain in biodiversity is possible given that the brownfield areas alone qualify as a Local Wildlife Site for their botanical interest. Rather than increasing connectivity (Section 8), development is likely to fragment habitats and increased disturbance on those remaining fragments will further reduce their wildlife value. Whilst it is an obvious role of a local plan to identify sites for development, it would be valuable to identify areas that can be incorporated into large-scale sustainable landscapes. This would help to avoid fragmentation of habitats to ensure they remain as a functional ecosystem and a biodiversity resource. It may seem an unconventional and negative step to preclude areas from development by identifying them for sustainable landscapes and biodiversity. Biodiversity objectives can deliver economic benefits to communities by creating employment through new projects, re-creating cost-effective ecosystem functions such as flood relief, enhancing the local economy through tourism and improving local surroundings. An audit of brownfield sites should be undertaken to consider their ecological importance, especially in view of the over allocation of land for housing and employment use within the District. Core Strategy Policy DM9 provides protection to Local Wildlife Sites. Section 8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity states: "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)); vi. Local and UK Biodiversity Action Plan Habitats (including Open Mosaic Habitats on Previously Developed Land); and vii. Protected Species". Draft Policy 19 provides protection to habitats and species of importance and includes Local Wildlife Sites. Protection is also provided through the NPPF Section 174. 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 features. Sites of regional and local biodiversity and geological interest, which include Regionally Important Geological Sites, Local Nature Reserves and Local Wildlife Sites, 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. The aim should be to protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity by ensuring all new development does not have a negative impact, but a positive benefit for biodiversity. Development should reflect and enhance the character and appearance of the local natural environment and be positive for biodiversity through design, use of materials, layout and landscaping. Draw attention to the two Local Wildlife Sites that are adjacent to the other proposed Garden Village location at Gamston Airfield: Gamston Airport Scrub and Grassland (LWS 5/358) and Brick Yard Road Ponds (LWS 5/1239). If a full application were to be submitted, we would expect the submitted documents to demonstrate how the nature conservation value of the LWS would be maintained during and post-construction.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP185	K Mee		Like to express my concern at the increased volume of traffic that would come through Eaton should the housing development at Gamston Airfield take place. When the bridge at Ordsall was being repaired residents of Eaton noticed increased traffic and because have no traffic calming facility in the village it became dangerous. There was an accident on the bridge in Eaton last Saturday night and should the development at Gamston go ahead traffic lights on the bridge as well as speed limit signs are essential. This small and quiet village has become a rat run especially at school times and only become worse with more cars associated with the planned housing. The combination of a narrow road and a single lane bridge are not conducive to safety. Welcoming the idea of a Garden Village and the additional infrastructure that would bring, it should not be at the expense of road safety in Eaton.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	Support part 1c which expects development in the garden villages to have good connections to green infrastructure routes. Supports part 8 which supports development only where significant harm to biodiversity can be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, if either criteria cannot be achieved, compensated for. Support the delivery of net gain, increasing connectivity of habitats and restoring/re-creating priority habitats where possible. Suggest that the potential to strengthen ecological and green infrastructure links between these two sites should be considered, including opportunities to link existing woodland areas and watercourses.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP187	T Swales		The two proposed Garden Village sites are too close together and the airport is a well known business hub that adds value to the area, so strongly suggest it is retained as an airport. Why not offer them incentives to develop it further?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP188	P Wood and N West		Gamston Airfield is on a scale not anticipated nor expected. Instead of being an addition to a small village, this concept is more like a small town, linking Gamston and Elkesley. The final outcome would no way be within your guarantees that towns and villages would "grow at a rate and scale commensurate to their defined role" as it would increase the size of a village of approx 80 properties by over 3000%. The airfield is on the edge of a small rural village and the creation of a "Garden Village" on this site does not fit your guidelines of Bassetlaw Villages "respecting their distinctive character". It is too close to existing settlements to become a new village and will have a detrimental effect in many ways including the price and saleability of existing properties in the village. The proposed site is currently in use and is not dormant as many similar propositions around the country are. Surely dormant brownfield sites would be much more suitable. The road networks around this area are already busy, especially in the mornings and evenings and with the addition of 2500 homes, of which you anticipate the majority of occupants will be commuting to work will mean a large increase in road use. Already increased use of these rural roads cause problems, including the road through Eaton which only recently has had part of the single lane bridge knocked down by a vehicle and the 90 degree bend near the river in Gamston at the bottom of Muttonshire Hill which in the last few months has had at least 2 cars smash into the bridge, with one nearly ending up in the river. Yes, the A1 is close, in view of rail links from Retford, more traffic will be using the rural lanes and roads to get to the station. There is also the issue of parking at the rail station and surrounding streets. Would increasing the number of new homes in walking distance of the station not be more suitable? This would reduce the number of vehicles on the road and reduce emissions. It appears that the link to the A1 is important as the anticipated population growth of Bassetlaw will be from migration with people moving into Bassetlaw but working outside of the area and commuting. Surely sites could be considered at alternative sites along the A1, that already have access and a "new" village would not have impact on existing villages or settlements, e.g. "Five Lanes End". There is no close village and commuting to Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield would be easier without overloading existing used and busy rural roads with extra traffic. Assuming the new homes will be varied and include family homes, what about the issue with schools and access to them. The new proposals will include new schools, but not until after 2035. What about the issues that will be caused with already oversubscribed schools and travel to them? No longer have a hospital in Retford and with more services being transferred to Doncaster, how long before the hospital at Worksop will be no longer available. Do not have the infrastructure in place for this scale of development. You anticipate the majority of occupants will be working out of the area and commuting. Why would they choose to spend their money locally when the "thriving" market town of Retford is no longer thriving. Just look at the local market, which is now less than half of what it used to be with the number of businesses that have closed. Building more properties in the town would encourage people moving into the area to use the towns facilities without the need to travel. If they have to get into a car to visit the town, why would they not just go to a larger place such as Doncaster or Sheffield. Figures used in the Plan regarding local labour was from a report dated 2014. This is 5 years old and there have been a lot of changes locally and not for the better. In a day of internet and online shopping this will get worse. More people move into the area, but they will not move here if the houses are not available. Although there are plans to extend the industrial site, with the loss of many skilled jobs already at the airport there is unlikely to be a boost to employment. There are plenty of empty business sites in and around Retford, how are you going to entice new businesses? With the increase to sites at the Blyth A1 junction, closer to the M18 and M1, don't see how this will work and the loss of existing jobs will outweigh any new roles created. With the scale of the building projections, this is likely to be taken on by large construction companies who tend to use their own contractors and would not be using local firms and labour. Would smaller developments be more beneficial to local companies using local labour? This appears to be a "quick win" rather than one that takes into consideration local residents and infrastructure. The plan uses scenic photographs of the countryside, and states that Gamston Airfield is "nestled in gentle undulations of lush green farmland". This would show a different picture if there were 2500 houses, and doesn't indicate the loss of wildlife and detrimental effect this would have on the area. Bevercotes Colliery would make use of a site that has been derelict since the colliery closed. Would still have an impact on local roads and traffic, it would create a new village that is not linked to an existing settlement and would have much less impact on the local community. It is a smaller proposition, but would have a large impact on new housing numbers and government targets. It would still have major infrastructure issues, but not on the same level as the Gamston Site.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP189	C Nicol		Oppose the closing of Gamston Airfield. The loss of over a 100 jobs is a lot of people to find reemployment. Where are the people who live in these homes going to educate their children? Retford doesn't have the capacity to take in loads of children. Drs are struggling now to see patients and if we need all these extra homes there is plenty of land round the area that isn't going to cost someone's livelihood. Where are the residents going to work? There aren't enough jobs in Retford to support all the extra people who may move here.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP190	Dr G Thelwell		Express my outrage at your ill judged decision to close Gamston airport to allow the building of houses. It is based on an incorrect designation of the land as brownfield by an incompetent environment minister. It like all the farms around is a green field site. So why not develop any of the farms nearby and save hundreds of jobs? Around the world countries are developing aviation infrastructure as fast as they can, whilst Bassetlaw proposes to destroy a thriving airport with a great future and prospects to grow. Such incompetence is mind boggling. Urge you to abandon this act of vandalism.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more
DBLP194	H Leggett	Emery Planning on behalf of J G Pears Property Ltd	The methodology used for site selection of the Garden Villages is clear. Note that para 12.4 the Council advises that the Parish of Bothamsall does not meet the methodology criteria set and that the Former Bevercotes Colliery site was treated as an exception to the methodology. This provides an unreasonable advantage to this site. The justification given for this is: "Given the size of the site and the fact that it is brownfield land and has an extant planning permission for employment, the Council considered it appropriate and necessary to include the site in the study. Section 11 of the NPPF (Making effective use of land) also indicates that Local Plan Strategic Policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs in a way that makes as much use as possible of brownfield land." The same approach should have been applied to all major previously developed sites within the District, including the Former High Marnham Power Station site, in order to ensure that all possible locations for the 'Garden Villages' have been appropriately and equally assessed. Suggest that prior to acceptance of the two 'Garden Village' locations identified in the Plan a further assessment should be made of the other major previously developed sites.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP195	J Beverley	Fisher German on behalf of The Hospital of The Holy and Undivided Trinity	Largely support the Spatial Strategy, have significant concerns with the garden villages. There is a lack of evidence and justification for the need for such an approach. In allocating the Garden Villages, the levels of housing to be delivered in Retford appear to have been reduced without justification. Retford is a clearly sustainable settlement which has a strong demand for housing and has delivered strongly since the Core Strategy was adopted, wherein it was the recipient of nearly a quarter of the growth proposed. This has now been reduced to 13%, with the Plan confirming this reduction in housing numbers was due in part to the delivery of new housing as part of the new garden villages. The reduction in the proportion of dwellings allocated to Retford is justified and could serve to frustrate housing delivery. The delivery of the two villages is not sustainable. The size of the Garden Villages whilst considerable, would still lack the critical mass to deliver a range of services, facilities and amenities that Retford benefits from. Certainly, the Garden Villages will never benefit from a train station (particularly one serving two lines), or the range of and breadth of bus services currently serving Retford, meaning they are fundamentally going to be less sustainable than Retford. Whilst the Council state the sites connectivity to Retford would enable future residents of the Garden Villages to utilise Retford's services and facilities, particularly the train station, this is going to be less sustainable than residents living in or adjacent to Retford where the services would be significantly closer and readily available. This is particularly true for the Bevercotes Colliery site, which is around 7km from the centre of Retford, circa 9km following the current road network. Considering this, again the proposal to pursue housing growth at the Garden Villages ahead of the delivery of additional sites within the sustainable settlements, such as Retford, is questioned. The location of the proposed new villages, straddling either side of the A1, will lead it to becoming a dormitory community with residents heading straight onto the A1 towards locations such as Doncaster and Newark daily for work. Such patterns are likely to lead to little benefit to the existing towns in Bassetlaw. Housing growth in Retford and Worksop is likely to stimulate growth and regeneration in those towns to a greater degree, with residents more likely to shop and spend there. Whilst the garden communities make an employment allowance, such developments are more logically and sustainably located near existing urban areas. The potential workforce in closer proximity is greatly increased and infrastructure capacity is likely to be readily available. It is a wrong to assume that a large number, if any, future residents of the Garden Villages would work at the employment available close by. This would be dictated, amongst other things, by the proposed employment uses and the price of the dwellings. It could be the case that large numbers of people from Retford, or further afield, commute into the Garden Villages, with residents heading out elsewhere. Considering that the planning system cannot control where residents work, it is considered sensible to locate such development where it has the greatest change of being served by a local workforce. Proposals such as North Lane, Retford, adjoining existing urban areas are more sustainable in both the short and long term. The delivery of large strategic sites are well documented as being difficult to deliver, particularly on brownfield land. In Rushcliffe Borough, Nottinghamshire, of the six strategic sites allocated for development within the Rushcliffe Core Strategy, only 1 delivered as intended. This is in part due to the complexity of delivering such sites. It is also due to the need for large investment in upfront infrastructure costs to service the strategic development. Appreciate the Garden Villages are only proposed to deliver a quarter of their total capacities during the plan period, this could still be optimistic. Research from Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners outlines that the determination period of an application of 500+ dwellings is in the order of 5.3 to 6.9 years. For the most part, this time period is due to complex planning issues. When an application is determined quicker than average, this is a result of matters being substantially addressed prior to submission which, when combined with the determination period, still adds up to the same amount of time; as the report states "there is rarely a way to short-circuit planning". Whilst the Plan and supporting documents refer to the extant permission at Bevercotes Colliery, this permission dates from 2001. This permission should be treated with a degree of trepidation, despite more recent variations of the permission and some of the conditions having been discharged. If the Council intends to proceed with these proposals, sufficient allowance should be made during this plan period to ensure the delivery of the assessed housing and economic requirements, separate from the garden villages. This would mean the allocation of at least another 1,000 dwellings in sustainable locations. A significant amount should be directed towards Retford, to ensure it is delivering a quantum of development commensurate with housing need in the location and its sustainability credentials. If, the Garden Villages deliver, this should be seen as windfall, supporting the government in its aims of boosting significantly the supply of housing. This approach protects the social and economic interest of the District, whilst addressing the local and national housing shortfall. The promotion of this strategy should not come at the expense of the future growth and associated investment in Retford, particularly considering likely housing need in the town.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP197	N Baseley	IBA Planning Ltd.	The principle of this is welcomed – and considered very exciting. This presents the Council with a fantastic (and once in several generations') opportunity to plan and deliver the very best, creative and sustainable new settlements – and that opportunity should not be missed by settling for conventional development often promoted by national housebuilders. In my experience, whilst national housebuilders will necessarily default to convention, they are often quite willing to raise the design bar as and when the need arises – and the Council should therefore not be frightened to insist on the very best levels of design, creativity and innovation which could put the new villages and the District on the map nationally, thereby also presenting an opportunity to secure significant inward investment and attract an additional and more diverse, skilled workforce into the area. Unless the above is sought, there is a real danger that, despite this amazing opportunity, the resultant developments will present themselves on the ground as little more than large dormitory villages, not at all dissimilar to many of the unremarkable urban extensions we see up and down the country.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP193	R Bowen	White Young Green on behalf of Stadium Development	<p>The proposed two new Garden Villages at Gamston Airfield and Bevercotes Colliery are supported. Consider that the proposals present a unique opportunity to develop significant brownfield sites in close proximity, both in private ownership in a predominately rural district. In doing so this will not only assist the district in achieving and delivering its housing supply requirements but the pressure to develop greenfield sites in less sustainable locations is reduced. The evidence base to support the selection of sites provided by the Bassetlaw New Settlement Study (2018) to identify the two proposed Garden Village sites is robust and sound. In the opening paragraph of the policy, reference is made to “the requirements below being fully met”. Consider that at this stage, care must be had to avoid language which could be overly prescriptive such as “fully met”, when detailed work in relation to the design, development and delivery of the settlements will be set out in other documentation, particularly the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which is envisaged to set out comprehensive a Masterplan and Design Code for each settlement. 1) Good Quality Design – the requirement for the villages to have distinctive characters and to be of innovative design are supported, albeit we would suggest exemplary construction standards definition would be consider at the time of actual construction. Consider some of the considerations set out in 1) e. are perhaps unnecessarily detailed and specific, such as ‘urban heat island’ effects which are not considered to be particularly relevant to a low-density garden village. 2) Housing – the delivery of 4,000 homes across the two sites is supported, of which a minimum of 1,000 new homes will be delivered by 2035. The proposed distribution of dwellings across the two sites is supported, as is the mix of house types and tenure and percentage of self-build plots. 3) Village Hub – the delivery of a village hub in each settlement is supported, and a hub provides an opportunity to not only provide facilities on scale to support the new villages, but to serve the existing settlements in the vicinity which have limited provision. 4) Employment – the allocation of 15ha of employment land at Gamston Airfield is supported, with sufficient flexibility to ensure that the site can accommodate demands arising at the time. 5) Infrastructure: Community Services and Facilities – the provision of facilities including nursery and primary education facilities in each village are supported. The provision of a secondary school at Gamston Airfield is supported in principle subject to a detailed assessment of need and capacity in existing secondary school facilities. Provision of facilities should be in step with the delivery of dwellings, the majority of which will be delivered beyond the plan period. Health care facilities in each village are supported as are recreational spaces including parks, sports pitches, play areas and allotments. We welcome the exploration of “high quality communications technology” but flexibility is required over what this may entail. 6) Infrastructure: Transport – support maximising sustainable integrated transport and connections between the two new villages and existing settlements through the implementation of a Travel Plan for both sites. Support the establishment of a network of pedestrian and cycle facilities between the two villages and existing settlements. Reference in b) to a dedicated pedestrian and cycling green bridge over the A1 is too specific at this stage. Paragraph 12.20, 4th bullet point, refers to a principle of “Delivery of an enhanced pedestrian and cycle routes between the new settlements, over the A1 to ensure optimum connectivity”. Wording should be included at 6b) as it is sufficient to secure the requirement without being unnecessary prescriptive and premature over the form of the solution. 7) Infrastructure: Flood Risk The requirement for a Strategic Drainage Study for both sites is supported, as is the delivery of any necessary flood mitigation measures and ongoing management of flood alleviation/drainage schemes. 8) Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure The principle of delivering biodiversity gains, increase connectivity of habitats and where possible restoration/recreation of habitats is supported. 9) Energy The principle of an energy strategy exploring the use of renewable and low carbon sources is supported, but regard must be had to avoid being over prescriptive in the policy regarding what form these measures may take given the speed at which the technology in the sector advances. Note that the term Gamston Airport/Airfield is used throughout the plan. Suggest it is more appropriate to use the term Gamston Airfield to describe the site. North Nottinghamshire Garden Villages brochure attached.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP205	H Godley	Fisher German on behalf of P Hinds	<p>Support the proposed Spatial Strategy, but have concerns with the promotion of two garden villages. The sustainability is questioned. Do not consider the delivery of the two villages to be more sustainable than delivery in and adjoining existing settlements in Bassetlaw. Raise concern that the location of the proposed new villages, straddling either side of the A1, will lead it to becoming a dormitory community with residents heading straight onto the A1 towards locations such as Doncaster and Newark daily for work. Such patterns are likely to lead to little benefit to the towns of Bassetlaw. Housing growth in the District's existing villages as well as towns needs to be the focus of the strategy to stimulate growth and regeneration these locations. The Garden Villages will not deliver these same benefits. If the Council intends to proceed with the Garden Villages, this should be seen as windfall, supporting the government in its aims of boosting significantly the supply of housing and contributing to housing delivery in the next Plan period.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP206	Mr K. Ashford & Miss	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Has a highway plan been approved for this unprecedented increase in traffic? Current infrastructure is unsuitable for such an increase- it is already dangerous due to insufficient speed restrictions, and narrow bends in Gamston Village. Exiting our drive-way is already very dangerous. Are the roads going to be improved before the start of construction? The use of heavy plant and increased works vehicles will be an immediate inconvenience to commuters. How will this be managed? How will the increase impact on traffic entering/exiting A1 – this is currently a problem with only approximately 300 residents in Gamston, how is it going to be improved with an additional potential 14400 residents? (Assuming 4 people per property) How many more petrol stations/convenience stores and other facilities are going to be provided to supply the increased population? And how will this impact the area? What impact will this population explosion have on Emergency Services; Hospitals, Doctors, Policing, Fire Services, which are all currently insufficient. How will it affect the Ambulance/Paramedic/Fire Engine response times to the surrounding areas? The police in Retford are underfunded and understaffed, and reluctant to come this far out of Retford, what additional measures will be put in place to police the new village? Brough on the outskirts of Hull was a smaller project and had its own police station built within the site. When this project is filled with young families it will have a larger population than some towns in the UK and should morally be marketed as such. Parking in Retford centre is already inadequate – how can this be improved? Currently top water from the airport runs under the road and through our land which adds to the existing problem with the river idle. The river idle is cleared in July each year which causes the river to back up and flood large areas of land including ours. What plans will be put in place to deal with considerably more top water coming from roofs, drives, roads, car parks ect? Local Wildlife will be affected by increased footfall/littering/potential increase in illegal poaching and malicious behaviour that occurs already. How do you propose to manage this? The mosquito infestation on our neighbours flood land has been reported to the council by our neighbour, cannot go outdoors in the summer. Been bitten 32 times in one afternoon and had to have medical attention. Will this now be dealt with by the council or will buyers not be made aware of the severity of the issue? What precautionary measures will be made for young children/adults trespassing onto private farmland and estates/lakes/wetland area as this already happens but on a smaller scale? (policing in farming/rural areas is notoriously difficult) Who will be responsible for such risks, how will Home insurances be affected by this? Increase in co2 emissions affecting wildlife habitats, environment, other health concerns and asthmatics (co2 increase of 4.6 metric tons per year each car a total of 66,240 metric tonnes from this estate. added to current 690 metric tonnes at the moment.) Is this in line with your government policies on looking after its constituents? The Airport is a fall-over for Doncaster Airport – what is the alternative? The airport is also a training centre for Pilots, will this be relocated? What provision is being made for the current traders on the Airport? Are local businesses and jobs going to be affected? Currently pay one of highest rate bands in this part of the country for the privilege of living in a rural village, the rates should reflect living among social housing in future bills. Pay a considerable amount of money for our property due to its location and seclusion. Have spoken to Hunters estate agents who have told us that if the build goes ahead at the airport our property will take a considerable drop of a minimum of 20% in value. Are there any plans to compensate the residents of Gamston and Elkesley? This appears to be one of the biggest housing developments under taken in the north of England, appreciate that new housing has to be built, building such a massive quantity in such a small village would appear to be unprecedented. From the councils point of view it appears you want to complete your targets of new builds in one big hit, all at the expense of the residents in Gamston/Elkesley and Retford whose lives will be devastated by these proposed plans.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP208	S. Weston	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Objection: What is the purpose of shutting down a working airport, to build 1000 required houses when there is room for 1,125 homes at a vacant site currently used for illegal raves and fly-tipping? Throughout the Draft Bassetlaw Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan (DBPPI) it is made clear that there is a demand for new housing in the Bassetlaw area . The numbers are shown in detail and are understandable. The plan shows that 1000 homes are required over those planned in existing urban areas. The Garden Villages seems to be the answer to the 1000 home problem. While I have no reason to doubt that these homes are required within Bassetlaw, I do doubt the need to create two new villages to provide them. Both the Colliery site in Bevercotes and the Gamston Airport site, according to the plan, have sufficient space for over 1000 new homes. Why, therefore, is there a need to spread the required 1000 homes over two sites one of which in the words of the plan is “nestled in the gentle undulations of lush, green farmland”? (These alone are strange words to describe “brownfield land”). The aim of the plan was never to find two sites. Why did that change? I understand that the only answer available is because, after the period of time covered by the plan, there may be a need for a further 3000 homes in the area. This seems, therefore, to be a plan, planning for circumstances outside of the remit of the plan. Should we set aside the AI (previously developed land?) for the year 2198? At what point does our planning for beyond the plan period cut off? My remark about the AI is facetious of course, but highlights the point which is, shouldn't the plan really only plan for the period covered by the plan?</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP208	S. Weston	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Objection: Current utilisation of the airport (employment). The proposal will involve closing down a business area serving the Bassetlaw region with more than 100 jobs most of which are “high quality”, to create a housing estate and no jobs. I am aware that new businesses tend to be small, small businesses tend not to have the capital to build premises. I understand that the land will remain vacant for five years, and then the rules will be relaxed (if not before) and with such fantastic links to the A1, 15 hectares of warehousing will doubtless arrive. It is difficult to see how empty land constitutes employment opportunities being created. If this plan is about efficiency, then should it not develop the wasteground at the Bevercotes Colliery site into a “garden village” or, more realistically, “housing estate”, then encourage the airport based businesses to flourish and grow?</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP208	S. Weston	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Objection: Current utilisation of the airport (land use). As a working runway, some of the land at Gamston airport is used for aircraft to take off and land on. This is an exquisitely efficient use of a runway . The hangarage is used for aircraft storage and maintenance, equally efficient at an airport. The office space is used by office workers, employed by companies based at an airport. The rest of the site is farmland. This also seems relatively efficient. Gamston is a working airport for business, leisure, flight training and the Children's Air Ambulance, home to 10 independent aviation-related businesses, providing employment for around 100 people, training facilities for emergency services as well as having a large acreage of productive arable agricultural land. It is hard to see how 15 hectares of wasteground is more efficient from a business point of view. It is also hard to see how a plan to build 375 homes built on a site spacious enough for 1,125 is in any way efficient. Especially when the land is described by the planners in 12.11 DBPPI as a “former spoil heap” and “large parts of the site remain open and are frequently accessed for informal recreation and subject to occurrences of antisocial behaviour, including raves, fly-tipping and off-road vehicle use.” As is the case with Bevercotes colliery.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

DBLP208	S. Weston	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	Objection: selective disregard for the NPPF. The plan fails to mention, and one therefore assumes pays no consideration to, its statutory duty Under Section 9, Paragraph 104(f) of the NPPF dated July 2018 which requires that Planning Policies should:- "recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time - taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy." Despite searching through a lot of "evidence" in the appropriate section, I have been unable to find any "evidence" that it conforms with the NPPF in this instance. I have, as the manager of a business located at the airport in question, not been contacted. I have not heard of other airport business employees having been contacted. I have seen absolutely no official representation of anything at all at the airport site in relation to this plan. I would even suggest that a lot of secrecy has surrounded the plan. Untrue statements have been made by representatives of the airport management in support of the Garden village plan. So I wonder how deeply anyone is concerned about the "economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy." Or the need for a national network of GA fields.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP208	S. Weston	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	Objection: loss of pilot training schools. The Bassetlaw Draft Plan, should it be adopted, will at a stroke, wipe out 5 pilot/flight training schools at Gamston Airport. These cannot simply be relocated like an ordinary business because obviously, they require an airfield and other airfields already have established flying/pilot training schools. The current size of these businesses suggests that they are unlikely to relocate even if there was a similar sized airport with limited flying schools anywhere in the UK.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP208	S. Weston	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	Objection: creation of "high quality" employment. Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd is based at Gamston Airport, providing flight inspection and validation services, navigational aids and communications equipment as well as airfield lighting systems, to both civilian and military customers worldwide. Part of a New Zealand based group (Radiola Ltd) with a total of 23 employees (increased from 14 three years ago), Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd has seen a steady growth period over the last three years building from 2 employees breaking into the UK and Europe market, to 8 salaried staff maintaining more than 4 contracts UK wide and many more contracts worldwide. With continuing growth at a greater rate expected and an increase in owned aircraft underway, Radiola will be forced to relocate out of the area. With no similar sized airfields in Bassetlaw this genuinely "high quality" employer will be forced to offer employees an option to either relocate with the company or volunteer for redundancy. DEA Aviation Ltd, operate and maintain a fleet of 10 "Special Mission" aircraft at Gamston Airport. One of their primary roles is to provide Airborne ISR (Intelligence, Surveillance & Reconnaissance) services to the UK Government and European Agencies, some of which are related to national security. First formed in 2006 DEA Aviation Ltd has invested heavily in its Gamston Airport operations in order to be prepared to keep pace with the future growth potential within the Airborne ISR market. Providing employment to more than 70 people most of whom are salaried and in highly technical and professional roles, DEA will without question be forced to relocate out of the area. Other companies based at Gamston Airport: • The five training schools • The airport staff consisting of cafe staff, Ramp handlers, ATC controllers, Fire service personnel, and various other personnel crucial to the operation of the airport, • Gemstone aviation, • Contrail Flight Services, • and the potential new tenants involved in anti-drone technology for airport security (due to recent drone activity at Gatwick and Heathrow Airports this field is in an enhanced growth period) who are due to open their doors in the next few weeks. The above companies are providing "High Quality" employment to more than 100 personnel across the airport, with the potential to grow in all areas. My understanding of high-quality employment fits perfectly with the salaried, professional, technical sort of employment included in all of the companies mentioned above. A more technical understanding might be available from the All Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation website where they promote scientific, technological, engineering and mathematical (STEM) skills and high-tech jobs. "The All-Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation promotes the objective - as set out by British Government - of making the United Kingdom the best country in the world for General Aviation, and to stimulate interest in the sector. Our goal is to ensure that General Aviation inspires both current and future generations to take up science, technology, engineering and mathematics, thereby creating high-tech jobs and growth in all nations and regions of our economy. In order to achieve this objective, the All-Party Parliamentary Group believes that a network of General Aviation airfields must be protected and enhanced by the government." "Put simply, the importance of General Aviation to boosting scientific, technological, engineering and mathematical (STEM) skills in the wider economy cannot be overestimated." (http://www.generalaviationappg.uk/) So, with the closure of Gamston Airport, these high-tech growth businesses would be forced out of having any form of presence within Bassetlaw.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP208	S. Weston	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	Objection: creation of "high quality" employment. The plan makes many references to how it will encourage employment in the Bassetlaw area, including the notion of "high quality" employment, although at no point that I can see does it define "high quality" employment, nor how it will encourage any sort of employment, nor yet what sort of businesses will be encouraged. "Promoting economic prosperity through the delivery of high-quality employment space and advanced communications technology, capitalising on the sites' location adjacent to the A1 and to the south of Retford." (excerpt /ram: 12.20 DBPPI) "As these settlements will be delivered over a long period of time, it is expected that they will need to be designed to meet emerging working practices. It is expected that there will be a higher percentage of home/flexible working that will drive the need for higher capacity, future adaptable communications infrastructure to be designed into the schemes from the outset." (12.23 DBPPI) Here, I think, we are reading about high-speed internet being the encouragement for new businesses. Relying on the new residents of the Garden Villages bringing their own employment with them, employing one or maybe two personnel at best. The assumption made by Bassetlaw planners being that they will be high-quality jobs. "The delivery of the new settlements must include new employment opportunities to ensure they are truly sustainable villages, not simply large housing estates. Therefore, the expectation is for the new villages to deliver at least 15 hectares of employment land. This growth will help meet the requirement across the district, as identified by the 2018 Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA)." (12.22 DBPPI) It is understood that this is a very proactive plan for the development of new businesses. Is there any way that Bassetlaw can ensure that only, or at least some, businesses offering "high quality" employment will be permitted to build on the 15 hectares of wasteland? Will utilities be built into the land left aside? Is there any guarantee at all that the businesses will not simply be warehousing, lorry parks, factories, as so often seen up and down the country "capitalising on opportunities associated with close proximity to the A1 corridor." (excerpt from: 12.18 DBPPI) From conversations with the planners at the meetings in various locations around Bassetlaw, the answers are not forthcoming, or flatly in the negative. A definition of "high-quality employment" is also non-existent or open to anyone's interpretation according to the planners. I have seen no hints or realistic suggestions in the plan which come close to replacing more than 100 salaried jobs. Especially when compared to the STEM skilled jobs provided through the continued operation of the general aviation airport supporting more than 10 independent businesses which is threatened.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP208	S. Weston	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	Objection: infrastructure. It is safe to assume that upgrading the A1 junctions closest to the proposed Garden Villages will take place. It is hoped that will solve those particular ongoing safety issues. The narrowing of the bridge as it is not capable of supporting two-way traffic, and the perilous on/off ramps travelling both north and south on the A1 at the junction of Dover Bottom and Twyford Lane. What about the traffic travelling East and West from the proposed sites? Will Bypasses for Bothamsall, Walesby or Ollerton be provided? Will traffic calming measures or bypasses be installed into Darlton, Dunham or Newton on Trent? The traffic pressure through Retford and Ordsall is already high at peak times, will a potential additional 1000 vehicles be catered for? Another route bypassing the toll bridge over the Trent to avoid the significant bottleneck which will doubtless become a problem with the enormous increase in the number of commuters. We will effectively plonk 4000 homes in the same area without a steady evolving period of improvement in the wider infrastructure which is already failing to fulfil the requirements of our modern trends. We are already seeing failures on the part of the council to control the traffic flows around Bassetlaw. 50 mph speed restrictions with average speed cameras along the A638 don't seem to have stopped at least 4 vehicles failing to jump the River idle in Gamston and Eaton in the last 3 years. This at the current level of traffic let alone a further 1,380 vehicles as a probable minimum. (1.38 vehicles per household, east of England, www.statista.com)	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP208	S. Weston	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	Do not support this ludicrous notion. When I was young I heard that you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. The villages, towns and cities of Great Britain have grown and evolved over centuries. The communities are born out of years of shared history. Building a "garden village" is a wishful way of saying building a typical housing estate with your heart in the right place. A housing estate designed for the most "efficient" use of space and best financial return, built as cheaply as possible, and provided with the absolute minimum allowed amenities and facilities do not make a "garden village". However much Bassetlaw Council wishes it does. I also wholeheartedly condemn the closing of businesses in the interest of "promoting business". A contradiction, which when said out loud sounds like a joke. It is impossible to force democracy onto people not yet ready for it. It is not possible to create a community overnight. It is very easy to force people into a lifestyle that they have no choice but to accept. Having said all of that, I will have to move out of the area to follow my job to another airport when Gamston is just a big bunch of ridiculous houses centimetres apart. No, I do not support Bassetlaw in their proposal to make the same mistake being made across the country and not instead learn from them.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP209	E. Dyer		<p>Objection to the inclusion of Retford (Gamston) Airport. 1. Closure of the airport will result in the loss of a business area in the Bassetlaw region that currently provides over 100 jobs which are already "high quality", such as aircraft pilots, engineers, operations staff, technicians, ground handlers, flight inspectors, air traffic controllers and fire officers. You are proposing to replace this with 15 hectares of empty land which will be protected by Bassetlaw for the next five years so that only new businesses providing "high quality" employment can build there. However, most new businesses tend to be small and often do not have the capital to build new premises. They would therefore be unable to set up on the airport site. I gather that after five years, the protection rules will be relaxed so that any business will be able to come in, including those that only provide low quality employment, such as warehouses and factories. How will this be an improvement to the current employment opportunities in the area? Surely it would make better sense to develop the waste ground at Bevercotes Colliery site and encourage growth of businesses at the airport site, especially as the Bevercotes site is described in the plan as a "former spoil heap" and an area "subject to occurrences of antisocial behaviour, including raves, fly-tipping and off-road vehicle use". 2. At no point in the plan does there seem to be a definition of the high quality employment proposed to replace the high quality employment already in existence at the airport. This is clearly defined in the All Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation website, where they promote scientific, technological, engineering and mathematical (STEM) skills and high-tech jobs: "The All -Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation promoted the objective - as set out by British Government - of making the United Kingdom the best country in the world for General Aviation, and to stimulate interest in the sector. Our goal is to ensure that General Aviation inspires both current and future generations to take up science, technology, engineering and mathematics, thereby creating high-tech jobs and growth in all nations and regions of our economy. In order to achieve this objective, the All-Party Parliamentary Group believes that a network of General Aviation airfields must be protected and enhanced by the government. Put simply, the importance of General Aviation to boosting scientific, technological, engineering and mathematical (STEM) skills in the wider economy cannot be overestimated." (http://www.generalaviationappg.uk). The closure of Gamston Airport would force these high-tech growth businesses out of Bassetlaw completely. 3. You state that "the present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land which could otherwise be developed for a use which is in much need". However, Gamston Airport is a working airport for business, leisure, flight training and the Children's Air Ambulance. It is also used by Nottinghamshire Police between 12 and 15 times per year for TPAC training. There are 10 independent aviation-related businesses which provide employment for over 100 people, as well as training facilities for emergency services. In addition, there is a large area of productive arable agricultural land. This strikes me as an extremely efficient use of the land which would not be improved upon by demolishing the site and following through with your plan. 4. The Bassetlaw Plan is supposed to conform to duties laid out in the National Planning Policy Framework. This states that planning policies should "recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time - taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency services needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy" (Section 9, Paragraph 104(f)). However, there appears to be no evidence that the draft plan conforms to the NPPF at all in relation to this aspect, even though Gamston Airport does already serve business, leisure, training and emergency service needs. 5. Closing Gamston Airport would result in the loss of five pilot training schools, further reducing the "high quality" employment in the area. It is predicted (by Boeing experts) that an additional 800,000 pilots will be required worldwide over the next 20 years. However, a high proportion of pilot training is being drawn outside of the UK due to a more advantageous tax regime towards flight training in countries such as Spain, and a more proactive approach to general aviation in the USA. Closing the five training schools at Gamston Airport will make this proportion increase. In addition, there is a national shortage of flying instructors as well as pilots and, again, closing the flying schools at Gamston Airport will make this situation even worse. The training schools cannot easily relocate as space at other airfields is required but it is difficult to come by. 6. You state that there will be highway improvements and I hope this refers to upgrading the A1 junction closest to the proposed Garden Villages. The slip roads onto the A1 at that junction are incredibly short and extremely dangerous as a result. The bridge that goes over the A1 at that junction has been narrowed as it is unable to support two-way traffic, so that will need to be strengthened and opened fully to have any hope of coping with the huge increase in traffic. However, has any thought been given to the road travelling between Ollerton and Gamston, past the proposed Garden Villages (A638)? The increase in traffic as a result of the proposed Garden Villages would be enormous and that road would be unable to cope with it. Will bypasses be built to reduce the pressure in these areas? If they are to be built, how much disruption will that cause for the years it takes to build them? In addition, there is already high traffic pressure through Retford and Ordsall at peak times so the extra vehicles will merely add to that and make the daily commute even worse than it already is.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP213	V. Hobday		<p>Objection to the proposal of development on the greenfield airfield. Are you aware of the numbers & variety of wildlife on greenfield Airfields? Not just the usual birds & Hawks but adders, numerous owls, woodcock, butterflies field mice & Hares. Give wildlife a home, space for people to view nature- airfields are wonderful, friendly places & on poor flying days, at dusk & early morning they do not mind if you visit to view wildlife & enjoy a walk.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP214	J. Elliott		<p>Objection to Gamston Airport proposal: I am writing as a light aircraft owner and pilot, who is resident at Durham Tees Valley Airport, which after considerable public support has been bought by the local Authorities to prevent its closure. Once an airport is closed it can never return as the cost is too high. Gamston Airport is one of the best examples of a General Aviation Airport in the Country and has invested considerably in hangars and other infrastructure. I am also aware of Government Committee. All Party Group on General Aviation, who are pressing for the protection of small airports, recognising their important role at present and increasing role in the future stating that they play a vital part in the countries economic success. This does not seem to have been taken into account in you draft plan, and it is not appropriate to simply say that an airfield represents poor use of land without taking account of the present and future benefits to the community that exist as have been identified by the public, local MPs, Mayor, and Councils in the case of Durham Tees Airport. The Committee also points out that ways should be explored for airfields and residential housing to co-exist at these areas providing the residents of the new housing recognise that they are living next to a airport/field. Any concerns over noise is easily resolved as with Gamston and the organisation of traffic patterns to avoid flying close to or over residential areas. However as found with a number of airfields some residents simply do not like aircraft flying in the area, despite the airfield being present before they moved to the area and press unreasonably for its closure by any means. As previously stated I am a private pilot and owner of an aircraft, I have no financial or other interest in Gamston Airport other than having visited it on numerous occasions. It is a jewel in the small airports that exist in the country and needs to be preserved and not simply swept away for a few extra houses.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP212	A. Bicknell		<p>Objection to the Gamston Airport proposal: • There is currently an epidemic that the Medical Entomology & Zoonoses Ecology, Emergency Response Department Science and Technology (ERD S&T) Public Health England are trying to understand and battle. The epidemic is an extremely rare and dangerous flood plane mosquito called Aedes vexans. The Gamston area is totally infested with the organism and any housing in the area would exacerbate the problem and put many more people at risk whilst also making the new properties almost impossible to sell. It is mosquito hell. • There will be an increase in traffic and there is already a dangerous amount of traffic cutting through Rectory Lane of Gamston on a daily basis. • House prices in Gamston will be reduced due to the village losing it's rural and quiet feel. • House prices in Gamston and surrounding areas will be reduced due to the closure of Gamston Airport. Many people utilise the airport as a form of transport. • Businesses will suffer due to the transport link the airport brings being closed. • A fantastic training resource bringing on new pilots will be lost. • The mass housing will generate more noise and general pollution to the area. • The lakes at the airport contain some very exciting bio diversity along with the Great Crested Newt I believe. • Bevercotes is also a fantastic nature reserve. • The diversity and wildlife that the Maune and the Mead hold is incredible and this development will have a direct impact on these important tributaries. At the end of the day myself and my family chose to live in Gamston because it is a quiet low population centre with no shops, pubs or many people. On our doorstep we have country walks into the Bevercotes areas and down the river past the airport. This is why all villagers have paid a premium to live in Gamston and it would destroy our homes having the village expanded by thousands of homes. Gamston is also an easy commute to Retford where I do my business. I am a major employer of people with some 50-60 people in Retford. As my business is generally internet based, if Gamston becomes a mass housing estate I will find myself having to move and thus have to relocate my business also to another area, county or even country. The plan is preposterous in my view and will destroy so much good.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP219	C Jesson	Planning and Design Group on behalf of the Welbeck Estates Company Ltd	<p>The garden village concept is welcomed in principle. Concerns are raised in relation to the overall deliverability of the two proposed garden village locations. Alternative, or additional long-term, strategic garden village sites will need to be considered in the future. Questions are raised in relation to the expected trajectory of housing supply on both sites and their relative deliverability. In order to deliver 1,000 homes, both sites would have to consistently deliver around 72 dwellings per annum from the estimated year of adoption in 2021. Not unfeasible, it is highly unlikely as neither site appears to have gained the momentum to facilitate the commencement of dwellings at 2021. Considerable lead-in times should be expected after adoption to allow for the production of SPD, cooperative master planning, decisions and negotiations associated with major strategic planning applications, any necessary site remediation and the satisfactory delivery of all pre-commencement infrastructure. Even where this runs smoothly it is not unreasonable to assume that the sites will only be delivering at the very end of the Plan's timeframe, whereby the delivery of 1,000 dwellings is very aspirational. The 2018 Bassetlaw New Settlement Study Methodology raises doubts over the viability of both sites. The methodology states that expected viability at Bevercotes is only marginal exacerbated by the need for significant off-site infrastructure contributions or works, including A1 junction enhancements and the creation of a Bothamsall bypass. Doubt is cast on the headline viability appraisal for Gamston given that an existing land use value has not been reliably attained. Significant off-site infrastructure contributions or works will be required to facilitate to the development, such as A1 junction enhancements and significant improvements to the local highway network. Question the deliverability of both sites within the timeframe of the Plan. Consider that further rural land allocations that fully adhere the garden village concept will be required to provide more market contingency and flexibility in the delivery of new homes across Bassetlaw. Further land allocations could act as a complementary, or alternative, approach in the delivery of sustainable rural development. There is an opportunity to deliver a new network of 'heritage villages' in Welbeck's land ownership. These would be tied to the philosophy and influences of the surrounding estates and parks that are characteristic of south west rural Bassetlaw. It could harness the opportunities created by the surrounding landscape aesthetically and take the form of individual villages linked together as part of a joined network. A network of 'heritage villages' would meet the Council's adopted new settlement core principles. This includes the creation of a free-standing community, not placing settlement coalescence at risk, include the ability to pursue exceptional design principles and benefit from proximity to a range of existing rural communities. While a joint garden village option is available, there remains complementary, or alternative, opportunities available for locations to be assessed for a new rural settlement. Opportunities as a whole must be further invited, justified and tested. Where the current housing trajectory continues to rely heavily on the proposed Garden Villages' further objection will be raised.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

DBLP220	E Crookes		<p>The Garden Villages proposal is tantamount to being a new Town development as it concentrates most of Bassetlaw's housing target in two places and does not need a lot of infill in the existing Retford villages. It achieves the current Government's requirements. By looking at a 30+ year projection there seems to be no consideration that Government policies will change over the years and it may be that there are two part-finished villages with insufficient facilities because there have been local, national and even international political changes. It is a garden village idea presentationally but realistically it is urbanisation of a rural and attractive area. The 'Garden' Village concept seems inappropriate when houses will be 'dumped/deposited' onto an area and as most new houses seem to be placed on site locations with postage stamp gardens! If this plan is more or less a 'fait accompli' (and feedback at local consultation sessions appears to be the case) propose that one Garden Village is built – preferably on the available site of Bevercotes and that if appropriate this model is then used for another site at a later stage. Having read the report into assessing the suitability of three sites (Carlton, Bevercotes & Gamston) the Carlton site is more conducive to development as it is close to an urban area such as Worksoy and not far from Sheffield. It is much closer to existing services such as regional and local hospital facilities and a greater concentration of existing and potential industries and employment opportunities. The two villages will be 'one community'. Each village would form its own identity and would not wish to be a single community particularly with the A1 separating them. Take on board that these areas are mostly Brownfield and are ripe for development. Proximity to each other is not a valid consideration because each one will have its own identity and will be separated by the A1 intersection even if road upgrading takes place. It appears there is a lack of information relating to the service providers in these villages and how they will tie in with current pressurised services, facilities and lack of qualified staffing. Recruitment in many of these public and private services and enterprises in this area is already very difficult. The rationale for the proposed two sites appears to be that they are both close to the A1 and B6387 connects the two sites and provides good connectivity with Retford and the East Coast mainline. Realistically the B road is narrow in places with bad bends and the A1 slip roads are short and the immediate stretch of the A1 is congested. This part of the A1 has had several accidents even since the Elkesley bridge has been finished. Local villages such as Bevercotes and Eaton are going to be more 'rat runs' and dangerous with narrow roads, bad bends and Eaton and Gamston bridges both significantly causing many road accidents. With 10000 extra people in the area it will mean that there will be too many vehicles for this updated road infrastructure. Cannot see that the house builders would be interested in investing in an updated road infrastructure until after the first 15 years. Retford Train Station surroundings and parking areas are packed. There is mention that 40000 journeys are made to use Retford Station now never mind when an extra 10000 people are living in the area!! It is well-known that young people want to live in or near large cities for employment, access to universities and colleges but for leisure and retail. Two garden villages whilst providing new housing may not be too attractive to young employed people and the new villages may have a predominance of older people who may not contribute directly to the local economy as much as they would if nearer to city conurbations. Many people will no doubt commute to local towns and cities and not to the Retford area. There should therefore be a focus around current centres of the population where there are appropriate employment opportunities and public services which could be expanded more easily and economically than setting up new standalone facilities in rural areas. Understand from people who have lived in new villages elsewhere that schools and other services and facilities are not provided until at least 10 years into a large house project. Does not take into account the economic development and nature of potential employment. Increasing the population does not necessarily guarantee any economic growth or even the population investing in their locality. These villages could become dormitory settlements whereby employees and employers commute to the cities as this already seems to happen increasingly in the Retford area. Initially there could be a lack of facilities and qualified staffing for such a large expected population. According to BDC staff at the consultation events it is not proposed to supply new school places until several years into the house building and perhaps not until the end of the first 15 year phase. New Schools are mentioned but wonder if house builders will be prepared to build them in the early stages of the new houses' development. Suggest the following: • reconsider the 3 areas which were previously considered for garden villages. Carlton still needs consideration because of its proximity to economic and social opportunities in Worksoy and Sheffield. • Reassess the need for new residential development on the Bevercotes and Gamston sites by looking at Retford and existing large villages where the concentration of population would be close to retail and leisure facilities. These facilities may need some enhancement but not new builds. • Investigate moving industrial and employment opportunities onto Bevercotes (already designated as industrial land) and Gamston sites from areas in and around Retford and use the industrial sites for new housing as they would be close to the A1 network, mitigate environmental issues and the use of local roads. • Further liaison with Notts County Council and regional authorities to ascertain the best way forward. Why were NCC representatives from highways, education, fire and other NCC services not present at the consultations?? • Ensure that further consultations involve local people who are likely to be affected immediately – A Gamston session was requested by the local</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP221	B Weedall	Gladman Developments	<p>Support the identification and allocation of the North Nottinghamshire Garden Villages. In particular the identification of the Former Bevercotes Colliery. The identification and delivery of the Garden Village will provide assurance that the long-term housing and employment needs will be delivered not only during the current plan period but will provide certainty in housing and employment land delivery for future Local Plans. The majority of the site comprises previously developed land offering the sustainability advantages of turning previously developed land back into use. The site has extant planning permission (09/05/00002) for employment development supports the principle of development in this location. Masterplan attached. The site could be extended to accommodate additional housing and employment land to assist in meeting Bassetlaw's housing needs in full. The proposed site offers: - A minimum of 1,500 homes - Primary School - Village Centre consisting of Doctor's surgery pharmacy, community building, retail and leisure facilities. - Sports park – Allotments - Pub/restaurant - Employment space. The Garden City Ideas have been one of the main design drivers behind the scheme with the integration of green space within the built environment of paramount importance. This has led to the inclusion of tree lined streets and avenues, the creation of recreational, woodland and sports park, the establishment of leisure walks and the realignment of the bridleway to connect to the Robin Hood Way. Consider that modifications to the policy are required. Would be happy to work with the Council to find the most effective policy: consider that the policy should be separated into 3 distinct parts. This could include a section containing aims and objectives (or aspirations), another being joint requirements for the two sites combined and then a separate section for each site with any site specific requirements. Some aspects are overly precise and are not yet borne from any evidence - it is important to get the balance between setting the parameters and affecting the deliverability through onerous requirements where further work is required with input from consultees, before it is known what a solution might comprise. May wish to rephrase the need for requirements to be 'fully met' when some relate to qualitative requirements and objectives or aspirations for the two sites, rather than precise measurable elements of the scheme. There is not a reference to the requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment that will need to consider the cumulative impacts of the new settlements and any committed development. It would be helpful to clarify that there are some matters where there will need to be a joint approach, which could reasonably be included in a section of the policy, which would then allow both sites to come forward with separate applications and separate phasing, but with the joint parameters that would also be established as part of the planning obligations. Recognise the importance of good design, concerns regarding a SPD to set out a comprehensive master plan and design codes for each of the Garden Villages. This could more efficiently be progressed through conditions for each scheme against a policy that sets out key parameters. This could save time in the early planning stages of the project and provide greater certainty that the 1,000 dwellings can be provided in advance of the end of the plan period. It is likely that there is a range of character areas and rather than innovative and/unique design, will focus on high quality design that will assimilate within the respective surroundings of each site, to deliver an exemplary village with high sustainability credentials i.e. reflecting the Garden Village principles. Much of this is included in the explanatory text and could be moved or duplicated in the policy. These read as a range of aspirations or objectives for this site and could be identified as such. 1A and 'contemporary constructions techniques', this might be better identified as exploring the opportunity to develop part of the site via modern and innovative construction techniques. 1c and 1d are supported. 1e - in terms of 'minimising energy and water consumption' this is too onerous and could be better worded as part of an overall approach to include solutions to reduce energy demands and water consumption. Otherwise this could require ecohomes, which do not believe the Council are advocating and this has not been considered as part of the viability assumptions. Do not consider that a low density garden village would give rise to 'urban heat island effects' and in terms of solar access, Bevercotes has a significant amount of trees. Could be addressed by an overarching policy to explore sustainable energy solutions that maintain flexibility for the most appropriate solutions for each site (which may be different for each site and/or comprise a number of solutions to be incorporated). Approve of self and custom build homes there are issues surrounding the delivery of such forms of development on larger sites. Note paragraph 7.20 states that the Council has received in excess of 60 requests to be put on their Self Build Register from June 2016 to July 2018 and the Council have included some of the location needs (which do not identify the Bevercotes area) but it is not evident whether these requirements would be content for a plot on a large site or a plot on a small site through Neighbourhood Plans. There does not appear to be sufficient demand for this form of housing to justify this policy. If this is retained then it should allow for flexibility and allow self-build plots to revert back to market housing as part of the wider scheme after a period of time i.e. 12 months. This will ensure that housing delivery is not stalled where there is no demand for such provision. Happy to explore this further in order to appreciate the number of plots. Secondary education: further studies are required to inform the requirements. Unclear what is meant by 'high quality communications technology' - clarify the aspects that should be considered, rather than setting a high bar without an idea of how to meet this aspiration and how this should be reflected in the viability assumptions. There are a range of options being considered for cycle links. A dedicated green</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP222	P Douglas		<p>The development of these two garden villages should not be done in isolation. Every effort should be taken to integrate the new villages with the surrounding villages, through road and cycle access. Ensuring existing services are enhanced in surrounding villages rather than introducing new services which will have a negative impact on existing services. Ensure present Educational Services are maintained in Elkesley & Gamston and expanded before new facilities built. Children who have started their Secondary Education at Tuxford should not be made to transfer to the new Secondary School. The impact of these two developments should have a positive rather than negative impact on surrounding villages.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston</p>
DBLP224	J Douglas		<p>Cycle access on roads between Elkesley and Bevercotes is difficult because of the dangers presented by the roads - in particular the A1 trunk road. Cyclists have for years used rights of way (illegally) to travel safely between Elkesley and Bevercotes. Most of the way is along existing bridleways to the south of the river Poulter. Unfortunately there is a section of path, to the north of the river Poulter, that is not a bridleway – it is designated as a footpath and therefore cyclists should not ride on it. An upgrade of this footpath to a bridleway will allow cyclists to travel safely between the two villages without the danger of being confronted by the landowner. The path in question runs from Brough Lane, across a field, for approx. 100m to a bridge - known locally as stone bridge – which crosses the river Poulter. Bridleways continue from the south side of the bridge. Upgrading this footpath would be a inexpensive but effective way to improve connectivity between the villages giving access to shared facilities and employment opportunities.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP225	D Dodds		<p>Live in East Markham - object to the proposals to convert Gamston Airport into housing. Do not fly, but do not want that opportunity to be removed for future generations in Bassetlaw. If this airport is closed, it is extremely unlikely that it would ever be replaced in Bassetlaw. So there must logically be an extremely good reason to close it. It is not like knocking down old shops, warehouses or farm buildings. The reinstatement cost of the airport would be absolutely huge and commercially unsustainable. Cannot see local or central government subsidising the establishment of a new airport either. Closing it would cost a number of highly skilled jobs that would never return. It would see the loss of fixed wing and helicopter flight training and associated leisure opportunities. If the logic is to build hundreds of houses near to the A1, just build them on a farmer's field. There are thousands of acres next to the A1 and any farmer would be delighted to receive millions of pounds in value uplift were agricultural land used. Converting agricultural land would be much cheaper and allow Bassetlaw to receive greater taxes and levies out of the massive development gain made by the farmer.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP226	B Barnett	Retford Civic Society	<p>The proposal to close the district's airport and replace it with a new village is regrettable. The airport is, and should continue to be, part of the economic infrastructure of the District. If it closes the area will be less attractive to investors. Air travel is a growing feature of economic life and Bassetlaw is well placed at present to benefit from this growth. But this advantage will be lost if the airport closes. The idea of new villages on previously developed land has some attraction, not least being that it would reduce pressure for development elsewhere. If the new villages are to proceed there must be robust arrangements in place from the start to ensure that each is developed in accordance with an agreed masterplan. This must ensure that from an early stage in the development residents of the villages have good access to schools, shops, bus services and jobs. Must avoid just creating an isolated housing estate in the countryside lacking the facilities to be a balanced community.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

DBLP227	N Morgan	Pektron Group Ltd	Concerned on behalf of our business which is a significant user of Retford/Gamston airport. Pektron Group Ltd is a manufacturer of Electronic assemblies, primarily for the vehicle industries. Turnover approaching £60 Million, and employ around 400 staff, who are mainly located at our head office in Derby, and at operations in Detroit, Michigan, USA, and Redditch in the West Midlands. Have two business aircraft based at Retford/Gamston Airport, a Citation C14 business jet and a Beech Super King Air 250 twin engine turboprop. These two aircraft represent an investment of around \$15 Million. Do not make such a significant investment and base the aircraft at Retford/Gamston for no reason. The aircraft are vital tools that enable our executives and highly skilled design engineers to visit and communicate with our customers throughout Europe. The choice of this airport is significant. The airport is around 40 miles from our head office, but the facilities are such that cannot find a better location to base the aircraft. There are small grass airfields suitable for leisure and training use, and there are major international airports such as East Midlands, but neither is a solution. The small airfields are not suitable due to length and runway surface, and places like East Midlands are primarily focussed on scheduled airline transport and do not prioritise Business users. They cannot offer the unrivalled convenience, simplicity and service at Retford/Gamston, which is regionally important. Suggest that this company chooses this airport despite the fact we are in a neighbouring county demonstrates the strategic importance of this vital transport infrastructure asset. By basing the aircraft at Gamston inject significant money and employment into the Bassetlaw District. The UK has long suffered with the destruction of transport infrastructure, a process which started with the Beeching cuts, the repercussions of which are still hampering the development of rail transport in the UK. It is for this reason that the NPFF mentions the importance of General Aviation airfields. Retford/Gamston is a nationally recognised and award winning example of this requirement and is an important part of this nationally important transport network. The plan fails to consider the importance of such a superb asset, and trivialises the value of the airport by saying it is "inefficient use of land". The airport offers most of the environmental benefits of the Green Belt but is a vital infrastructure asset of national importance. It would be more efficient to build a garden village on agricultural land, as the economic impact would be significantly less damaging. The Council should be proud of this facility; it is the best in the region, and should be treasuring and nurturing the airport rather than looking for reasons to destroy it.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP228	Dr J Hillman		The construction of two new villages appears to have been added at a late stage. In relation to Rural Bassetlaw, clearly, these proposed new villages are not, as stated: 'proportionate growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development'. They risk severely damaging the local environment while blighting nearby rural communities. Proposals to build new towns on Gamston Airfield and the open space of the former Bevercotes Colliery are inappropriate for the locations. The Plan itself recognises that these proposals would jeopardise existing business, destroy open landscapes, threaten recently restored open habitat and; create excessive local traffic. The Draft Plan is therefore contradictory and confused. Section 12.15, 'The former Bevercotes Colliery is enclosed within dense woodland, while Gamston Airfield is nestled in the gentle undulations of lush, green farmland.' Section 12.17 How can a new housing development on a, a currently open, green airfield, and b, in a wooded site, be considered 'inherently rural in nature'? With these factors in mind, neither site is suited to housing development without significant detrimental impacts to the surrounding environment. Less experienced local planners may not be aware that in 2003 an 'administrative oversight' led to the deletion of a footnote in PPG3, noting that airfields and hospital grounds should not be considered as appropriate brownfield sites. Current definitions of previously developed land make no reference to airfields or flying sites. As a result, developers and local planning authorities are increasingly and inappropriately treating airfields as brownfield sites for land redevelopment, leading to the loss of an important part of national transport infrastructure and the destruction of significant areas of natural habitat within airfield boundaries. Gamston Airfield is a busy, popular general aviation airfield, with a vital history. It is in open countryside, and supports thriving commercial businesses. Gamston Airfield is repeatedly stated to be 'brownfield land', despite considerable confusion and continued debate on the classification of open areas within active airfields. It is recommended that the proposal is withdrawn and the Council work closely with the All-Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation (APPG-GA) to discuss new planning guidelines aimed at further protecting airfields. There are likely to be significant commercial opportunities to further develop the site as a vital asset, without adversely impacting the local environment. May wish to seek advice from Stratford-upon-Avon District Council, who are committed to keeping the thriving, yet similarly threatened Wellesbourne Airfield open as a strategic asset to the local and national economy. If Gamston continues to operate, and Bevercotes is built on, what measures will be taken to ensure that any proposed development at Bevercotes does not impact lawful flying? Any development should recognise recent planning policy which ensures that it will be up to developers building new properties nearby to identify and tackle noise problems. Under the new guidance, the onus will fall on the developers who build the houses to soundproof the properties.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP229	S Ashton		Support the principle of two new garden villages. The villages would be better located at Bevercotes former colliery and Cottam Power Station. Gamston airport is a popular rural airport and an employment site. Would be better if it was retained as an employment area to compliment the nearby new residential development at Bevercotes. The owners of Cottam PS have recently announced that the power station will close in September 2019 and this would be a good location for a new settlement. The delivery of a garden village at Cottam PS could be on a similar timescale to a garden village at Gamston airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP230	D Argent-Cook		The suggestion that the site is currently underused and the land use is ineffective wholly false. The airport supports on average 16 flights per day, is home to a flying school and employs many highly skilled local residents. The classification as a brown field site in its entirety is misleading as the airport only utilises approximately 25% of the proposed site with the rest being laid to productive farm land. The suggestion of building in two phases a total of 2500 homes would lead to the loss of this facility, the highly skilled employment opportunities and productive farmland. It would appear that no thorough assessment has taken place in terms of road capacity and road safety as this falls to the responsibility of the county council and highways England in relation to the A1. The characteristics of the roads connecting Gamston, the surrounding villages and smaller settlements are not constructed to a modern standard conducive to modern vehicles and driving. The above can be evidenced through identifying many fatal crashes over the space of just a few years. The river crossings of the Idle and its tributaries are unsafe, with three cars colliding with the bridge on the B6387 in Gamston over the space of just four months. The bridge at Eaton has been partially demolished by vehicles on two occasions in the past two years. The bridge over the A1 on the B6387 at Doverbottom has been subject to single lane traffic controlled by lights for over a year due to structural weakness. The A1 junction and the slip roads may be improved as part of any development, but not the bridge itself as it is only deemed to support a B road. Looking at national trends, each residential property provides 6 car movements a day per house. So would create serious congestion into Retford, onto the A1 and on to other nearby towns. Over time these car movements will be doubled as most homes have additional cars as families grow up. More preferable to encourage and retain industrial and commercial ventures on the two sites as it would produce many times less small traffic, with much of the large heavy traffic straight onto the A1. The plan refers to other sites have been considered and discounted as Garden Villages. If this were a true consultation, the identity of these discounted sites should not be withheld nor should the reasons for discounting them. The area is rural in nature and all of the surrounding villages also retain a rural feel. It is not possible to retain a rural nature with 4000 houses. It might be better called a new town as a descriptor, the two closest towns namely Retford and Tuxford had just over 9000 and 2000 properties in the 2011 Census. The Council do not hold the remit for school provision. Gamston C of E and Elkesley Primary Schools are near to capacity, but serve their local communities well. Suggested the new Villages would have schools these not be up and running prior the completion of the first phase of 600 properties. So where would the children go. New schools are only authorised when existing demand proves the need for investment and this is assessed at Notts County Council. This is a non political process which only becomes an obligation with certain criteria. In the meantime, the pressure would be on existing facilities. Retford would not be getting an appropriate share of new residential development. Development in Retford is sustainable with existing health facilities and schools. It makes sense to focus new development in urban areas such as Retford and NOT the rural villages. The suggested facilities in the new Villages do not sound congruent with other locally provided new settlements. E.g. the Kings Clipstone Garden Village, does not have the economic, leisure or social facilities outlined and this is a picture across the country. Health facilities in Retford are short of staff. Primary and secondary healthcare and mental health services are struggling to operate e.g. Medical Imaging department in Retford only operates 2 days a week because of shortage of staff. Patients have to travel to Worksop, Doncaster and Sheffield for hospital treatment. Qualified clinical staff prefer to work in the larger hospitals. Bassetlaw hospital has difficulty in recruiting staff. It is one of the smallest hospitals in the country. Modern health workers like to be where the specialisation is, in the larger hospitals. The proposed growth is likely to be older. It is not a good idea to put these people in Eastern and Northern Bassetlaw a long way from main health provision and hospitals.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP232	N Oldbury	Elkesley Parish Council	The plan favours a small area of the district with housing, on top of the very large growth figure of 20% that is already identified for the villages already. The key ethos of a garden village is having an area that you live in, that you can walk or take local transport to work, but former ministers and MPs have made it clear that developments on a small scale may struggle to fit in all the community facilities that would be needed make it self-sustaining. Government has also said that the developments will be distinct new places, with their own community facilities, rather than extensions to existing areas. The proposed area is attached to an existing village so is not a distinct new place, and its not large enough to make it self-sustaining like a garden town. Good garden villages are those that have been developed by business to house workers, like Bournville. This proposal does nothing to address the needs of the existing population or those of any new residents - it is not comprehensive and become a ghost village during the day and a sink estate by night. Makes assumptions on behalf of other agencies that it has no control over and is not able to guarantee, for instance: schooling and roads are controlled by NCC. No agreement by NCC to provide services - spending on roads has reduced over the last few years, health services are at breaking point and the NHS are having difficulty getting more surgeries into the area. The availability of hospital cover for children during the evening has been recently withdrawn at Bassetlaw hospital and there are no overnight services. A large housing development should be more evenly spread across the district and close to essential services as possible. "The New Settlement Study" only looked at large scale housing sites, it did not look at any areas in Retford or the surrounding district to supply a smaller quantity of housing spreading more evenly throughout the area? There is no discussion about extending the Shireoakes or Harworth developments. Both developments already have a "broad range of community services and facilities" available and are "strategically well located with good road links to the M1 and A1 via the A57 and good rail links to the wider region". Both on the north side of the district close to the existing Bassetlaw Hospital and Workop College, and in easy reach of the main cities of Workop, Sheffield, Rotherham and Doncaster. Whilst this Plan identifies the need for employment there is no discussion regarding the loss of the skilled jobs within Gamston, or the replacement jobs being industrial. The assumption is that this "will provide local employment opportunities for the new residents as well as existing rural village working age population." This quote is demeaning and implies that new and existing residents are not skilled workers. Within the local villages there are doctors, teachers, nurses, Members of Parliament, Judges, farmers and more. To say "providing B1c, B2 and B8 uses to meet local demand", is implying you don't expect any skilled professionals to live in the area. The range of employment opportunities should be broad enough to cater for professionals and unskilled workers looking for employment. Concerns over the very high volume of houses proposed for both sites and the assumptions that have been made to quantify the proposal. The proposal utilises a brownfield site when currently there are over 400 acres of existing farmland that are still in use and producing crops and employment in the district. BDC has not correctly identified the amount of brownfield and farmland areas, and people have not been able to make an appropriate informed decision on the merits of the proposal. Would like to see the amounts displayed correctly and what cost considerations have been used in order to validate using rural locations for mass housing. This proposal assumes that the people who live on the Garden Villages will either use the A1, work from home or work on site. This is naïve considering the majority of people currently either work in Retford, Workop and surrounding villages, and not everyone will either work away from Retford or within the garden village area. With a development of this size and in this area, families will have to travel for everything, work, school, supermarkets and social events. It is estimated that from every household there will be 6 journeys per house a total of 6000 per day rising to over 24,000 upon full completion of the development, in addition to the industrial traffic. Over the 17-year period from 2018 that will be a vast number of extra vehicles, using the existing local rural road network and A1 corridor. Do not see any traffic assessment included to support the assumptions that have been made regarding vehicle usage. The proposal only discusses improvements to the highway network including access to the A1 for the use of vehicles, but not how the A1 will be upgraded to support the increased traffic flow. What the timescales are for this and what funding has been identified to complete this. Does not identify which roads on the existing network will be upgraded, over what timescale and what funding has been identified to complete this. Does not identify any agreement with NCC to upgrade these roads. Have concerns over the rural road networks ability to cope with the increased demand, even with a staged approach to development. Currently Brick Yard Road is very low priority for maintenance and floods on a regular basis and gritting is rarely done except in prolonged periods of bad weather. The road doesn't have footpaths or streetlights, and in a world where we are promoting walking and cycling this proposal in its current form does not address these problems. The B6387 between the A1 and Gamston is fairly well maintained. It doesn't have streetlights or pavements until you reach Muttonshire Hill, it's not conducive to promoting walking or cycling. The proposal highlights the requirement for a dedicated pedestrian / Cycle bridge between the two sites, but it does not address the issues of pedestrians or cyclists wanting to leave the site to another location by foot or by bicycle, where pavements or lighting are not available. Would like to answers prior to any agreement to the proposals. Would like a specific pedestrian / cycle bridge from the Gamston airport site to Elkesley to	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP233	K Davis		The development of the garden villages should not go ahead. Will have a detrimental effect on the surrounding villages, it will not enhance them. The environmental impact, extra traffic on small country roads will cause numerous problems and cause untold problems for the wildlife. Totally against the proposed development.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP234	M Turner		Object to the proposed redevelopment of Retford Gamston Airfield. Local and national government policies are reacting to the increasing need for new homes, especially affordable homes. The political pressure to rectify this housing shortfall should take a balanced approach. The need for employment to support uptake of new houses is equally important. The Airport directly supports approximately 100 skilled jobs. Section 3.2 of claims that this will have a 'relatively limited' economic impact and new jobs will be created within the garden village. This fails to define the type, skill level or numbers of new jobs that would be created, whether permanent or temporary, or what facilities will be created to house the jobs. The national tendency for large supermarkets and the move to on-line shopping indicates that retail is unlikely. Without a clear plan as to how new jobs are to be created and considering the differential in skills, and income, generated from the new jobs then the new plan is simply to destroy jobs in favour of houses. The approach fails to consider that the airport has a wide range of users from students to executives, to aviation businesses. These highly skilled people are the current and future entrepreneurs who are likely to invest and take a risk to generate new employment for others. Removing the airport is likely to result in their move outside of Bassetlaw having a negative economic impact. The destruction of skilled employment to build houses is contradictory to strategic objectives 4 and 6 for economic development and fails to recognise the opportunity the airport presents as a local economic hub. It would remove a vital local and national facility that is impossible to re-create once destroyed. The plan would displace 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft, including business jets and the Children's Air Ambulance, with no alternative accommodation in the area. Has significant flaws and ignores the national requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in NPPF paragraph 104f. It fails to consider "the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs" and Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support such opportunities. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which as an active airport this is clearly not. Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. The local consultation meeting stated that other airports, such as Scampton, could replace Gamston. This is a fallacy as the closure of other airfields is causing pressure on the few other local airfields. Netherthorpe is too small, Scampton is unlikely to open to General Aviation, and Doncaster is unsuitable due to its scale and Public Transport role. The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Workop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. The plan states that Retford has experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, without the need to destroy existing infrastructure. The 'garden villages' are to be targeted at Sheffield overspill. This is counter to the documents stated aims and a risky endeavour given the distance from Sheffield. It is likely that commuters living at Retford and working in Sheffield would not be in the 'affordable housing' bracket as transport Sheffield is not easy and costs/travel time is prohibitive. Those willing to travel that distance would be in the minority and not require the scale of development planned. If the aim is for Sheffield overspill, then brownfield sites further north on the A1M at Blyth or Tickhill/Styrrup would likely be more successful. Fails to provide evidence for the scale of development or the viability of the development at Gamston, or Bevercotes. It is also not backed up with a viable economic argument that would generate the needed employment in the area. Gamston represents an opportunity to act as a focus for skilled economic regeneration. Examples of other airfields in the UK and Europe show that airfields can become economic hubs. Gloucester Airport is an example of a thriving UK small airport that is owned by 2 district councils. They have supported the airport and its continued growth over many years which in 2017 was home to around 180 aircraft and 40 aviation-related businesses employing more than 500 people, plus a further 2000 jobs on the adjoining business park. There is enough land available at Gamston to create a larger business park, leisure facilities and further hangars. Expanding the range of businesses at the airport to include a technology centre or similar would make it more attractive and increase economic activity. This in turn would generate more skilled jobs, demand for houses in Retford and retain the airport. The airport would complement and support housing development on its periphery and at Bevercotes.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP239	R Pickering		Strongly object to the 2 new garden villages. ● the local rural roads will not manage, anyone driving to workop will go through bothamsall which is used dangerously as a trunk road ● there is major chaos when the a1 shuts due to accidents (Which is quite a lot) and traffic is gridlocked in retford ● concerns over where the new house owners children will go to school. Local schools are already bursting at the seams. ●The same applies for doctors surgery and bassetlaw hospital which cannot manage and has a children's ward which is only open in the day and has to ship patients to Doncaster at night. ● there are better locations which could be added onto instead of building new 'villages' - retford/ordsall/workop ●by building on the airfield you are taking away numerous businesses which cannot be relocated elsewhere. So taking away people's livelihood ● by removing the 'No fly zone' from the current airfield we will be subject to much larger planes and noise pollution as well as major light pollution from these massive new built areas. ● the slip roads at twyford bridge are already a major safety hazard, it's not safe to put hundreds more cars a day onto the a1 on those slip roads - there is not adequate slip road to get into the a1.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP240	D Tarmey		Clear that considerable thought has been put into the plan overall and there are some excellent proposals contained within the draft report. Object in the strongest possible terms to the 'garden village' at Retford (Gamston) Airport. Bevercotes colliery is a better location for housing and would allow the provision of sustainable housing without the adverse impact on nationally significant air transport infrastructure and local businesses that would result from the development of an otherwise thriving regional 'General and Business Aviation' airport. It is possible to achieve a balance between aviation and housing or industrial developments; this can be achieved by building on the land that is not fully used for aviation purposes within the airport curtilage whilst retaining an active airport. Part of the site bounded by a strip of land immediately to the West of runway 03-21 and the disused 1940's airfield perimeter track can easily be developed. This would result in the loss of the smaller crosswind runway but would allow upwards of 99% of air traffic movements to continue, affecting only the smallest of aircraft on a few days each year. The plan shows a lack of awareness of significance of the airport at a local and national level. The loss of approximately 100 highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering and support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development). It is understandable that the true scale of economic activity has not been considered because it is likely that only landowners (not tenant businesses will have been notified during the drafting of the plan). Investigate this further see https://www.saveretfordairport.co.uk/#business The plan is misleading in stating that the development uses 'predominantly previously developed land at Gamston Airfield'. It should be noted that the letter and spirit of national planning policy cannot be used to treat all aerodromes and airport sites as easily developable 'brownfield land'. Most of the land is currently undeveloped and in productive agricultural use. The All Party Parliamentary Group for General Aviation has addressed this point - refers to their letter. Does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in NPPF paragraph 104f. This is not referenced in the plan. Do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create new community and transport infrastructure, facilities and services. This paragraph seeks to improve economic growth in Retford but it is difficult to see how relatively low skilled work in a garden village could compete with employment at the airport in skilled engineering roles and how growth could occur if airport businesses (including the European Headquarters of companies such as Radiola Aerospace, DEA or the flying schools which require an operational runway) are driven away from the area. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance. Makes a case for local housing need in Workop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. Indeed, the plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP241	G Taylor		I can't beleave you can possibly be serious about your proposal regarding Gamston airfield .Has the world truly gone mad ?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP242	P Laycock		Object about the proposal to build houses on and destroy Gamston airport. This proposal if it goes ahead will mean another piece of valuable aviation infrastructure is lost from this country, which is extremely short-sighted and will mean valuable highly skilled jobs will be lost from the Retford area. Once lost these people and skills will be gone from the area . Travel by aircraft quite a lot, in small private aircraft across the country and spending money wherever I visit.....if the airport at Gamston is bulldozed in favour of a "Garden Village " (which is a nonsense term for just new housing estates) this income stream from myself and hundreds of other visitors will be lost to you.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP243	S Atkinson		Object the plans for Gamston airport to be turned into a garden village. Live on the B6387 and know how busy and heavily congested this road can be in particular when the A1 when is closed which is a regular occurrence. The speed limits are often ignored and there have been frequent accidents involving the bridge over the river, one of which only occurred 3 weeks ago. Inviting more traffic onto this road would just be increasing the accident risk, the safety of those who live on the road and the pollution and noise pollution caused by increased traffic. There is a lack of information regarding how it will effect our local services such as policing and healthcare - work locally for the NHS and witness on a daily basis how demand is outwaying the ability to supply. Services are struggling and by increasing the population to the extent proposed can only have a detrimental effect. Understand a GP practice is planned - this does not consider how local hospitals, community health services and policing will be able to cope with such an increase in population. Schooling is a big worry. Understand the development would be completed over a number of years however there are limited places currently at local schools and to accommodate more pupils until the new schools are built would have a negative effect on those childrens' education if the local schools were to expand will lose the benefits of being a rural school. Light pollution would also effect those living near the site including myself. Gamston village is a small, quiet yet adequately served village. By expanding the village on this scale it would lose its identity and rural yet close to town feel which is the reason why I chose to raise my family here. There are more appropriate and less disruptive sites available within the Retford area which would benefit from development rather than destroying a village that does not need or would benefit from more than doubling in size.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP244	V Brown		It would be a shame for the area to lose Gamston Airport which supports not only the airport but a few small businesses with staff from the surrounding area. Gamston airport has been providing a service and businesses for many years and it would be a shame to lose this facility. It is also part of the history of the village. Considering the area around Retford/eaton/Gamston there are other areas to utilise without any businesses having to suffer or close. Each year with the increasing problem during the summertime with mosquitos it is not an ideal Village for families - are increasingly unable to sit outside during the summer months or have windows open without flyscreens in place which is far from ideal for children who maybe susceptible to infection/disease from Bites. The road between the A1 exit and Gamston regularly floods in heavy rainfall with water across the road and is a danger to motorists. There are current issues with the A1 flyover road with constant traffic restrictions and in increasing the number by 1000's of vehicles from the proposed villages would can only increase these problems. Drs surgeries are unable to cope with the number of patients as it is we are unable to get to see a GP and only offered telephone appointments which if far from acceptable. The infrastructure of the area is currently unable to cope and the small road bridges in the villages are constantly being damaged and have weight restrictions so how are these going to be adapted for the increased usage? The A1 slip road is inadequate for exiting the Road without concern for your safety. Would be interested to hear why such a small Village needs to lose the airport and provide such a huge number of houses. There are already numerous housing estates being built by developers in the local area and concerning in that many are shoddy and provide purchasers with constant problems due to poor workmanship and inferior quality products used in their builds! Regularly hear of the homebuyers ongoing problems with large developers such as Harron Homes, Persimmon group with poor reputations in the area. They have huge profits and bonuses for executives whilst putting profit before purchasers. It would be sensible to provide small builders and self builders with the opportunity to build their own high quality individual dwellings that will enhance the area. With Less Homes being build but far improved in quality it could only be an improvement for buyers and homeowners.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP245	P Bland		Open space should be a prime consideration in the new villages and any new commercial or industrial development which could enhance policies 14, 18 and 19 may be more suited to the new villages. There should be no out of town shopping areas unless they cover both Retofrd and Worksoip. If there is a need then a development within the boundary of the new garden village at Gamston would be convenient.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more
DBLP246	K Evans		Gamston has NO local amenities; there is no shop or health facilities. Roads are under-funded and dangerous – 2 cars have been pulled out of the river in the past 6 months alone. Our walk to school includes crossing the main road where vehicles regularly speed past my 8 and 9 year old at 60mph. This is dangerous and an accident waiting to happen. The quiet village road past Gamston Church will have increased traffic as it already is a cut through - there is no way to expand this road. A significant number of new homes within a 2.2km radius will only increase the traffic and the likelihood of severe injury or death to local residents. The main road connecting these 2 new villages to each other and the A1 is in desperate need of repair. The bridge has been reduced to single lane traffic with no intention to repair in sight. This is a Nottinghamshire County Council issue. With that in mind how can the plan suggest it is the developer's responsibility to correct and maintain the infrastructure? Have limited public transport services and these will only decrease with lack of funding. This leaves no choice for residents (old and new) but to drive. Village school (and other local schools) are only a few places off full capacity. To have such a massive increase in families locally will only stretch educational resources further in an area that is working hard to achieve high standards. Nearest health facilities, shops etc are in Retford, Ordsall, Tuxford – have moved into the area knowing this and are happy to NOT have these facilities close to home. Enjoy spending time and money supporting local shop owners in Retford, value their contribution to the community where town centres are dying due to out of town retail and housing. The vitality and future prosperity of the town centre is something that needs addressing NOW and not left to diminish in the future. The environmental impact on our village, its residents and visitors will be huge. Aside from a huge increase in traffic, lacking road systems and general expenses for the maintenance of a heavily used road network valuable farmland will be developed into a concrete jungle for homes. This will impact on waste, flooding, wildlife (hares, stags, partridges, buzzards, hawks are all present) and ALL residents quality of life and that is before discussing the pollution from additional cars, homes, lights etc. Fortunate to have Gamston Airport in our village. The Plan states that one positive outcome will be to reduce aircraft noise. There is currently very limited 'noise' from the airfield. If we lose this valuable local asset the air-space restrictions will be lifted and we will get INCREASED noise from lower flying larger commercial aircraft out of Doncaster. Two garden villages close to each other is ludicrous and does not constitute a 'balanced growth' or 'spreading the population' throughout Bassetlaw. Map on Page 33 clearly shows towns and villages occupy both the northern and southern half of the region with area to the south and east of Worksoip and to the east Retford being underdeveloped. Support the proposal of residential dwellings on the old Bevercoates Pit site due to its previous use. Do not support the proposal at Gamston Airport. Fortunate to have a growing industry and a highly skilled workforce present at the airfield in our community. Should be encouraging children and students to strive for such employment opportunities so Bassetlaw can 'lead the way' encouraging and supporting viable businesses for the benefit and future growth of our local economy. Should not be instrumental in closing specialist businesses and diminishing current and future employment opportunities for residents. Why should residents of Bassetlaw only aspire to be employed in low skilled/ low paid roles? Aware there is space around the airfield that can be used for light industrial operations - with the existing infrastructure to the A1 and HGV's not needing to come through the village, this would be the better option. The Plan does not plan for the future, specialist highly skilled industry needs to be encouraged and taken advantage of, as does the expansion of viable businesses (as stated in the Plan) that already occupy the Gamston Airfield site. Having previously lived in a 'Garden Village' have experience of planning and on-going development issues such villages bring. These will become a problem with these Villages. The layout of dwellings and the design of road networks were ill thought through, 90 degree sharp bends, a maze of through-roads and cul-de-sacs. Steep inclines making winter mornings lethal (no council grit service) if you could get off the estate at all. Minimal parking provided and garages build to 70's regulations (modern cars don't fit) means cars, vans, motorhomes, caravans are all forced to park on the narrow roads. This in turn made estate roads single lane traffic. As children born on the estate mature the number of cars per household increase, coupled with children living at home for longer often meant those '2.4 households with 6 journeys per day' ended having at least 4 cars with 18 journeys per day (as no public transport links) and that was before visitors! Our neighbours in a 5 bed house actually had 7 cars, 5 of which parked on the road! Facilities promised in original plans - shop/pub/community centre/nursery/ play-parks/ Doctor etc never materialised. 10+ years on residents are still fighting for a basic play park due to developers arguing that it isn't their responsibility even though it was in initial planning documentation. Do not be naive that the plans will not be changed. Light industrial units were scrapped in favour of more housing and amenities (which still haven't materialised). Residents use health services in neighbouring villages (which are full). The improved education did not materialise with locals travelling between 2 and 15 miles in a car to other provisions. Some 15+ years after phase 1 the local parish council continues to address the roads appear to be too narrow and of unsuitable layout (90° bends) to allow for safe access of emergency services and utilities. No bus stops. The whole of Cavendish Estate still only has one access route. Emergency services may not be able to reach the estate. Still no amenities such as shops, schools etc have been added to the plans. The open space with play park needs better access. The plans show several	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP247	WR Prince		Object to the proposed closure of Gamston Airport. The Local Plan refers to Gamston Airport as a brownfield site. Such sites are old redundant, former industrial areas. Gamston Airport is certainly not in this category. It also grossly underestimates the scope and type of employment at Gamston Airport. It also disregards the government's desire to support general aviation.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP248	A icke		Objection to the plan involving the building of houses on the Gamston Airport. The Airport is a solid source of revenue and jobs for local people as well as offering transport options bringing in much needed outside investment. Trust you will reject any plans for projected building that will negatively affect this valuable resource	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP249	A Brown		Development as total inappropriate completely destroying the small airport and completely ruining the small village of gamston. Putting this into perspective gamston has at the moment less than 80 homes but the plans are giving figures of 4000 new homes to be built. Completely out of proportion ! The infrastructure even with the new development will add great strain on the road network and destroy the lovely village atmosphere i enjoy being a gamston resident, indeed my grandparents and great grandparents lived and loved this village and am appalled that Bassetlaw could even contemplate such a devepment. Not against a percentage increase in housing around the village but a increase of 4000 homes on a village of less than 80 is completely wrong !	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP250	A Wilson	Gamston with West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council	Gamston with West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council conclude that they are unanimously opposed to the plan in its current form. The plan doubles the population of a rural area. Question why the sites have been selected, from a number of possibilities, to take forward the plans for residential development to meet the needs of a growing population. The selection criteria for the sites are not transparent and not helpful. The Council recognise and accept the need to develop housing and related services for a growing population but they are unsure why this plan has been presented on such a scale as they are aware that the Council is 7.9 years ahead of its building needs. Given the high levels of deprivation in Worksop, and places like Harworth and Bircotes, it would make sense to divert scarce economic resources away from a dubious proposal, such as the one at Gamston Airport and surrounding rural villages, to housing and economic developments in deprived areas. Although Gamston airfield is officially designated a brownfield site, its current usage and location seems more relevant to concerns that one might have were it designated a greenfield site, especially when you compare it with the former Bevercotes Colliery. Development at Bevercotes would be more acceptable than at Gamston. Concerns around the impact of such a development on Gamston itself, not least - given the ambitious target figures for new housing on the site - on the road infrastructure and the impact on surrounding villages. The Plan refers to sustainable economic development as part of the overall vision for Gamston but is short on detail as to what precise economic developments might be and what impact such developments might have on the local infrastructure. The direct carbon cost of building new homes is the start of the impact on the local environment. New homes need maintaining, as does the infrastructure associated with them: streets, lighting, electricity, sewers, gas and telecommunications etc. New houses are likely to increase the amount of car transport and they can destroy the surrounding valuable countryside or wildlife rich brownfield sites and rural areas. The local plan will destroy nationally important aviation infrastructure leading to the loss of advanced technology and engineering businesses and pilot training. It will leave the Children's Air Ambulance without a base in the Retford area and will result in the loss of approximately 100 highly skilled jobs. Understand the ethos of a Garden Village that embraces the ability to live and work without the need for anything more than local transport which is self-sustaining and environmentally responsive. The plan is too large for the proposed area and is attached to the end of an existing village, similar developments have failed in their aspirations of community and resulted in ghost towns, poorly designed and creating multiple and complex environmental and social problems for residents. The "New Settlement Study" only looked at large scale housing sites, alternative options exist by exploring areas of Retford that could be developed on a smaller scale, where their impact on the existing infrastructure would be of no real consequence. Retford offers access to rail connections and removes the further need for people to use, in particular the A1 road and its feeder network in order to shop and work etc. The roads around the Gamston are not suitable for heavy and sustained traffic. Residential properties create a greater burden of car usage i.e. approx. 6 journeys per day per property. Gamston and the Bevercotes would be more suitable for industrial development and the housing needs met elsewhere.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP251	Mr & Mrs Wagstaff		Support the creation of the two new villages and support a larger number of houses being built on these sites as opposed to the numbers being put forward for Worksop and Retford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP252	J Shaw		As a part-owner of a thriving limited company based at Retford (Gamston) Airport, strongly object to the inclusion of Retford Gamston Airport in the Bassetlaw Draft Plan. Section 3.2, Results of the Bassetlaw New Settlement Study Methodology relative to Gamston Airport states: "The single significant negative effect relates to the loss of employment land through cessation of airport operations. However, the scale of employment opportunities is likely to be relatively limited" There are roughly one hundred, often highly skilled jobs provided at the airport, either directly by the airport or on-site cafe (Gamston Aviation), five Approved Training Organisations (ATO's) and Declared Training Organisations (DTO's) which provide training towards European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) standards and other specialised aviation related businesses including the children's air ambulance. Many of these businesses provide employment in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) roles directly. Para 12.9 of the Plan states: "Whilst development of the site would result in a loss of airport related employment the new village would provide opportunities for new employment" All current businesses at the airport are very specialised and require an airport site to operate from. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village'. Many other airfields would also be effected as multiple local airfields provide maintenance facilities that Gamston-based aircraft use. The Plan underestimates both the scale of potential job losses and the value of the airport in providing highly specialised services to the local and national economy. There is also a contradiction as the Visions and Objectives states: "Facilitating development opportunities that will enhance Bassetlaw's economy through the delivery of new and the expansion of existing enterprises, providing jobs across urban and rural Bassetlaw." Para 3.2 makes clear: "In order for the Bassetlaw Plan to be successfully developed and adopted, it will need to be in conformity with the NPPF" The NPPF 104(f) requires planning policies should: "recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy." It is clear that the Draft Plan is not taking this in to account and is not in conformity with the NPPF and is wrong to consider the airport as "inefficient use of land" (12.10). Look elsewhere at poorly-utilised land (such as the Bevercotes site) redevelopment of which will not effect existing business and operations.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP253	M Tyas	Branton Knight Ltd	Section 3.2 Results of the Bassetlaw New Settlement Study Methodology relative to Gamston Airport states that: "The single significant negative effect relates to the loss of employment land through cessation of airport operations. However, the scale of employment opportunities is likely to be relatively limited" Most disturbing that the loss of employment on the Gamston Airport site is passed off so flippantly without any corroborating evidence or supporting statement of facts as to how many jobs would be lost or what businesses would be affected. Paragraph 12.9 of the Plan states: "Whilst development of the site would result in a loss of airport related employment the new village would provide opportunities for new employment" And no attempt to quantify the job losses, or potential gains, from any redevelopment of the airport site. How many of the planning department staff have visited Gamston Airport to find out exactly what happens there? How many of the elected members and Planning Committee members have visited? It is not just about a handful of jobs but 10 businesses that could be forced to close because they are all aviation industry related companies. Sets out details of 13 businesses/operations operating on the airport site including specialist engineering firms, flying schools, maintenance contractors, Childrens Air Ambulance, café and the airport itself. Only the first 2 itemised have direct employees of the current owner of the airport, Gamston Aviation Ltd. All have invested time and effort of their owners and staff to start the businesses and grow them but in most cases also the funding of investments in both onsite infrastructure and aircraft. There is around 100 jobs that will be lost with 10 separate independent businesses having to be wound up in addition to Gamston Aviation Ltd, and another, Dukeries Aviation Ltd, that will have its business severely adversely affected. Airport is also used by Nottinghamshire Police between 12 and 15 times per annum for driver training in TPAC (Tactical Pursuit And Containment) on the little used runway designated 14 / 32. The draft plan mentions that 17,000 people from Bassetlaw commute daily for work to such as Sheffield, Doncaster, Newark and the surrounding areas. Strongly encourage the Council to look at all the tangible benefits of preserving Gamston Airport, to retain the existing businesses and employment but also for it to continue to provide a strategic resource to Bassetlaw to help attract new businesses to the area. Without a large influx of new businesses to provide employment for people locally then building thousands of new houses will achieve is to vastly increase the number of commuters out of Bassetlaw providing a limited contribution to the local economy as well as creating more road traffic and so mitigating any efforts made to reduce carbon emissions and limit the environmental impact. Paragraph 3.2 states that: "In order for the Bassetlaw Plan to be successfully developed and adopted, it will need to be in conformity with the NPPF" but has failed to provide any mention of, and therefore no consideration to, NPPF Paragraph 104(f) which requires Planning Policies should: "recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy." The Council has not evidenced that it has fulfilled its duty under the NPPF, in fact quite the contrary relative to paragraph 104 f). Suggest look at the Government's General Aviation Strategy and information from the All Party Parliamentary Group for General Aviation, especially the Airfields Working Group. Two of the fundamental issues that the APPG are working to address are those of adequate and cost effective pilot training in the UK and the fact that aviation is at the heart of high-tech jobs and skills and so is promoting STEM jobs through General Aviation. Boeing experts predict, that an additional 800,000 pilots will be required worldwide within the next 20 years. Because of a more advantageous tax regime towards flight training in Spain, and a much more proactive approach to General Aviation in the USA, a high proportion of pilot training is being drawn outside of the UK which needs to be addressed. There is also a national shortage of flying instructors as well as pilots and yet the Plan, will wipe out 5 pilot / flight training schools. These cannot be relocated because they require an airfield and other airfields already have established flying / pilot training schools. The airfield is also home to several High-Tech Businesses & Jobs including DEA Aviation Ltd operate and maintain a fleet of 10 "Special Mission" aircraft providing services to the UK Government and European Agencies, some of which are related to national security. DEA Aviation Ltd has invested heavily in its Gamston Airport operations in order to be prepared to keep pace with the future growth potential within the Airborne ISR market. Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd provide flight inspection and validation services, navigational aids and communications equipment as well as airfield lighting systems, all to both civilian and military customers worldwide. The closure of the airfield will see the demise of two very high-tech companies and the loss of high-tech jobs and overall loss to the local economy. Pektron Group Ltd will be forced to relocate their 3 aircraft out of Gamston – who use it to fly staff and customers to their base in Derby. Another high-tech growth business would be forced out of Bassetlaw. As well as having a large acreage of productive arable agricultural land how can it be possibly be deemed to be an "inefficient use of land" (12.10 of draft plan). It is disappointing that the Council is using the provisions of what is seen as flawed legislation that allows a wider airfield / airport site, irrespective of its additional use as agricultural land, to be considered in its entirety as 'Brownfield'. Natural England are a statutory consultee on plans that are likely to cause the loss of 20 hectares or more of BMV (Best &	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP254	R Pickering		Object strongly to the building proposal on Gamston Airfield. There is already substantial building works proposed at the Bevercotes pit site. The removal of Gamston airfield doubles the land site for residential and commercial residences. The area is also a designated no fly zone for Doncaster Airport. The cessation of Gamston current flights would open the potential for polluting and disruptive passenger airliners. This directly impacts the health of all new and current residents of the local area. If there are to be new residential developments, why allow polluting vehicle traffic directly overhead? The area is not big enough to sustain the proposed developments when coupled with Bevercotes. The road infrastructure is primarily rural with poor condition and size roads for the dramatic increase in vehicular traffic. This applies to passenger vehicles but more appropriately to the extra demands with commercial deliveries including passage of HGV, articulated lorries.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston

DBLP256	R Flanagan	Gamston Flight Training	Strong objection to the proposed development at Gamston Airport. Shocked to find that BDC were considering closing Gamston Airport to build a housing estate. Gamston is a General Aviation facility and is an award winning airport famous for its high standards of service to the GA community, throughout the UK but also Europe. It is a major asset to the local area and lifts the local areas profile significantly. Apart from the many commercial and private movements of aircraft and people, Gamston Airport is a large training base for Private and Commercial pilots. Operated from Gamston for 15 years and from my school carry out training and examining of all levels of pilots from private to commercial. Work for, and on behalf of, the Civil Aviation Authority examining our future airline pilots and have many qualified private and commercial pilots come for their annual revalidation of their licences. From a pilots point of view it's a great airport to operate from. From my point of view it's a great place to work, with very few other UK GA airfields that tick all the boxes that Gamston does. Gamston Airport fills a training/testing requirement that other larger airports cannot meet. Doncaster for example, will not accept training flights for months because of reaching capacity. At Gamston there has been an application with the CAA for almost 3 years for GPS approaches approval which is close to being implemented. This will be a huge asset as well as taking the strain off Doncaster and Humberside Airports. At the moment am obliged to fly to either Blackpool or Liverpool to the west, or Gloucester or Cambridge to the south to complete revalidation flight tests, where only part can be completed at Gamston. The local major airports ie: East Midlands, Doncaster, Humberside, Leeds Bradford, do not have this facility. Once the change is implemented, such Flight Examinations can all be carried out at Gamston. From a cost and environmental point of view, this change will be major - and will place Gamston Airport at the forefront in UK GA airports. There are a number of companies based at Gamston that carry out important work, from medical transplant flights to military contracts. An important development for us that has been approved by the airport management, is the acquisition of a Spitfire which took part in the Battle of Britain and is being restored at Biggin Hill. The restoration is due to be completed and the Spitfire positioned at Gamston Airport in January next year. The cost is £3.2M, a serious investment. This would be a major lift for the profile of the airport and the local area, attracting many visitors from all over the world. Because of the proposed closure, the investors are having second thoughts about basing at Gamston, without some assurance the Airport has a future.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP257	J Worthington		The plan to create two new large 'garden villages' adjacent to each other in rural Bassetlaw, is not the correct way forward. Strategic Objective 1 in relation to 'the Bassetlaw Plan Vision' is to 'manage the scale and location of development to support a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas' (6.13 page 36). Two new 'garden villages' adjacent to each other surrounded by tiny villages and hamlets will contradict this objective and could potentially result in an urban development built in a rural area but without any improved facilities, as has already happened in other areas across the UK. Page 73 seems intent on achieving this 'dream' of building the garden villages as it states that, 'Workshop has not met its housing requirement since the Core Strategy was adopted. It is considered appropriate to reduce the town's requirement to 1600 (24% as a percentage of the overall delivery. This is still a significant proportion of the requirement but it recognises that there is a need to support the delivery of a new settlement and rural communities in the delivery of housing'. In other words, building in the town is being reduced to make way for swallowing up our Nottinghamshire countryside, which is not acceptable. Table 7 The Neighbourhood Area Housing Requirement & Supply for 2018 to 2035 shows a requirement of only 24 new houses in the villages of Gamston, West Drayton and Eaton and 8 in Markham, Clinton, Bevercotes and Milton, which is classed as rural Bassetlaw, so why should these villages have to have an additional 1,000 new houses built in a large development amongst them? Even the town of Retford will only provide another 853 houses in this timescale! The Plan calculates that there will be a requirement across the WHOLE of Bassetlaw for 390 dwellings per annum for the plan period. This methodology is flawed because the calculations are based on figures from 2017 to 2018 when many more houses were built than in previous years, so is this a true reflection of the actual requirement or should the calculations have been based on a longer period of time? Surely the population of Bassetlaw is not expanding that rapidly and these new houses must be to accommodate people coming from outside the area. Bassetlaw have exceeded the requirement for new housing and are 7.9 years ahead of building needs. Strategic objective 6 is to 'Promote rural Bassetlaw as a living and working landscape, where new development responds to local needs and opportunities, and protects the intrinsic character of the countryside'. This demand is not local and two new urban developments or garden villages will not protect the intrinsic character of the countryside but seriously detract from it. Policy 12 sounds unrealistic and reminiscent of the vision in the late 1950's and early 1960's for the Park Hill flats in Sheffield and look what happened there! Desperate need and high ambition created a long-term nightmare for residents for years to come. The B6387 is subject to flooding every winter in the location of the fishing ponds that were the result of subsidence a few years ago. Retford cannot cope with the amount of traffic coming through as there are regularly queues to get around the town and that will only get worse if the new development goes ahead. The access on to the A1 at Twyford Bridge is extremely dangerous and would require major work to cope with the extra traffic. How will this infrastructure be funded? Developers will not want to soak up their profits on carrying out this work and the Community Infrastructure Levy won't cover the additional expense. Air pollution will increase. It is high due to the proximity of the A1 but with possibly 12,000 extra vehicles (allowing for three per house), this will be much worse. Light pollution will increase due to all the additional streetlights, illuminated street signs etc. The Daily Mail 11th February 2019 that 'Light pollution is affecting 'more than half' of key wildlife areas causing disruption to plants and animals' natural cycles'. The report stated that this will get worse with continued economic development. This must be a good reason to restrict any future development to already illuminated areas such as towns or larger conurbations rather than amongst small villages whose street lamps are turned off at night. There will be a lack of employment in the area. By closing the airfield jobs will be lost. Once the building work has been completed, the villages will not be self-sufficient but reliant upon commuting for employment. The study acknowledges this by stating that it expects a number of the new residents will actually be working from home. A massive assumption! The crime rate will increase and will not have any extra police to deal with it. The Office for National Statistics reports that the crime rate in Nottinghamshire increased by 11% in the year to September 2018 in comparison to the National Crime rate which only rose by 7%. The new development will only add to that further. The proposal will include a medical centre and pharmacy but the hospitals will not be able to cope with the growing population. The proposals include a lot of assumptions regarding the infrastructure. It seems to think that the lives of the existing residents will be improved by this development and will be doing us a favour by 'supporting rural communities'. Residents moved to this rural conservation village without any facilities, for a reason and it wasn't to be surrounded by a new housing estate, higher crime rate, higher pollution levels, lack of employment opportunities and much busier roads. There are alternatives: The idea of expanding present rural service centres (for example Tuxford which has a number of shops and facilities), although not ideal, would make more sense than building new towns from scratch. At least some of the facilities would be there already and could be improved and built upon. The proposed North Nottinghamshire Garden Community would provide 1000 new houses before 2035. It would be more balanced to spread these out between the other four spatial strategy strands of Worksop, Retford, Harworth and Bircotes and Rural Bassetlaw. Redevelop the site at Cottam Power station when that closes in September. Bassetlaw is well ahead of fulfilling the housing requirement, so what's the rush?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP257	J Worthington		The New Settlement Study is a desktop study based on data available from the Internet. Google maps were utilised which are now well out of date, hence some of the information gleaned is incorrect and the study is misleading. Policy 12 states 'The main objective (of the study) was to identify land for housing purposes which could form an independent settlement without the drawback of coalescence with existing settlements'. This statement is contradictory, as part of the reason for an area being put forward as suitable for development by the study was that it had some amenities in close proximity that could be utilised by residents of the new settlement! Page 10 of the study deals with environmental and landscape considerations and states that, 'It will also be important that the size and scale of any new settlement respects the relationship with existing settlements and to avoid coalescence and negative impacts on existing communities'. So how does this sit with building 'North Nottinghamshire Garden Community', a large housing estate the size of a small town, only 500 metres away from Gamston conservation village? Gamston village has only 246 inhabitants at the last census and is surrounded by farmland and open fields with the River Idle flowing through it. The only amenity is the school which is at full capacity. The village is quiet and is the reason for people choosing to live there. The operational airfield with its significant wartime history is good for the local economy, by providing jobs and attracting visitors from other parts of the UK and Europe, many use the hotels and restaurants in the surrounding towns and villages. The airfield would be closed if the proposed development goes ahead. The study links Gamston with the neighbouring village of Elkesley, being within 800 m of the proposed site, but on opposite sides of the A1. It awards them points towards the proposed development stating that when combined, they provide 'excellent access to existing primary services' of two primary schools, a shop, PO, medical centre and pharmacy. In reality, there is NO medical centre or pharmacy and the PO is situated within Elkesley Memorial Hall and only open for two afternoons per week! The Sustainability Appraisal Appendix 5 page 381, also states there are a number of recreational/ sports facilities within 800 m of Gamston Airfield. There are not! When describing the reasons for Gamston Airfield being selected, the study also states that 'No heritage assets are located on or in close proximity to the site' (page 35). There are a number of listed buildings in Gamston conservation village; the main one being the Grade 1 listed St Peters Church. This will be in direct line of sight of the proposed development, which according to the detailed assessment will be 500 m from the village. There were initially six possible locations identified for the proposed garden villages but three were discounted by the study following the Sustainability Appraisal. Some of these were discounted due to negatives in relation to public transport and proximity to heritage sites and also that they were greenfield. In relation to public transport, Gamston airfield had similar distances and facilities and is only 500 m from the conservation village and Grade 1 listed church. Appears that the reason for the airfield being selected is that it is brownfield. In relation to the runway, hangars and associated buildings this is correct, but a large area of this site is ALC Grade 2 agricultural land and should be greenfield. The study is factually incorrect, very misleading and appears biased towards proposing Gamston Airfield as a suitable site by using a play on words and making the information fit. It would seem that the decision has already been made to develop the adjoining sites, and that the residents of Gamston and the surrounding villages will be bullied into accepting the proposal. If the villages go ahead there needs to be more emphasis on the infrastructure surrounding them which will need massive improvements including new roads to by-pass the existing villages. Gamston Airfield scored well in the study in relation to the road network, but the information was incorrect, describing the B6387, Ollerton Road as a dual carriageway (page 77, table 4.4.3.1), when actually it is a narrow road with sharp bends, at least three of which are 90 degrees. There is a very narrow bridge on one of these bends (Muttonshire Hill junction with Rectory Lane) and this has been the location of many road traffic collisions. This is the main road that the village will emerge onto and is the main road into Retford from the airfield, running directly through the village of Gamston. (Carlton in Lindrick was discounted from development because access to the site was from the A60 that travels through the conservation village into Worksop). Double standards!	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP259	R Worrall	Historic England	It is not clear how the draft Plan is consistent with its own policies in terms of Chapter 16 text and associated Policy 21 in respect of Chapter 12 North Nottinghamshire Garden Villages and draft Policy 12 relating to the proposed garden villages at Gamston Airport and the former Bevercotes Colliery site. Chapter 16 and draft Policy 21 set out requirements for the consideration of non-designated heritage assets, which potentially exist on both sites, yet the evidence base information contained in the 2018 Settlement Study and Sustainability Appraisal methodology don't make any reference to these. Gamston Airfield is a former World War Two and Cold War military airfield, now a civil airport. It functioned as a military airfield between 1942 and 1945, and was reopened between 1953 and 1957. The wartime airfield was provided with three tarmac and concrete runways, heavy bomber hard standings, four type T2 and one type B1 aircraft hangar. There was temporary accommodation for the base personnel. Initially it was used as a satellite for training crews based at Ossington (14 pilots Advanced Flying Unit) and later it was an operational bomber base, used by 82 (subsequently renumbered as 86) Operational Training Unit, 93 Group Disposal Unit, 3 Aircrew School and 30 Operational Training Unit. From July 1945 it was used as the main resettlement camp for repatriating Royal Australian Air Force personnel. After a hiatus in activity it reopened in 1953 as a satellite base for military jet aircraft. After the military left in 1957, the airfield was used as a motor racing circuit and for agriculture. Are aware that in 2001 a number of wartime military buildings including the control tower as well the runways and part of the perimeter track were said to still be extant and aerial imagery indicates that some elements may still be in place. The Bevercotes Colliery was developed between 1953-8, and included the construction of a model Koepe winding system with twin concrete winding towers. Was one of the deepest coal mines in Britain, working to a depth in excess of 1000m. It is not clear whether the towers remain at the site or not but, notwithstanding that issue, there is the potential for non-designated industrial related heritage at the site since we understand the site has not been remediated. It is unclear from the 2018 Settlement Study Tables 2.1 and 2.2 how non-designated heritage assets have been considered with since there is no reference to them. Furthermore, Page 33 of the Sustainability Appraisal methodology accounts for designated heritage assets only. The study sets out that for both sites 'no heritage assets are located on or in close proximity to the site'. Since both sites have the potential for containing non-designated heritage relating to previous uses it would be expected that the study information would include information and assessment of this matter. Without such information it is not clear how non-designated heritage assets have been considered as part of the Plan process in respect of the two garden village sites. It is not clear whether there should be additional criteria required as part of Policy 12 in respect of the historic environment informing any masterplans for the sites - Policy 12 Part 1b refers to local man-made and natural heritage only.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP260	S Edgar		Object to the plan to build housing on the site of Gamston Airport and the adjacent land. The Airport is a valuable asset for the community and supports a considerable number of jobs. The closure of the Airport would result in a long term loss to the local economy. The area to the west of the Runway is actively farmed. Bassetlaw should be proud of this valuable local asset and must do everything possible to support its long term survival for the good of the community.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP261	A Argent-Cook	On behalf of All Saints Parochial Church Council, Eaton and Gamston	Find the suggestion that the site is currently underused and the land use is ineffective wholly false. The airport supports on average 16 flights per day, is home to a flying school and employs many highly skills local residents. The classification as a brown field site in its entirety is a misleading as the airport only utilises approximately 25% of the site with the rest being laid to productive farm land producing arable crops. The suggestion of building in two phases a total of 2500 homes would lead to the loss of this facility, the highly skilled employment opportunities and productive farmland. If the building of this many homes were to be allowed, it would appear that no thorough assessment has taken place in terms of road capacity and road safety as this falls to the responsibility of the county council and highways England in relation to the A1. The characteristics of the roads connecting Eaton and Gamston, the surrounding villages and smaller settlements are not constructed to a modern standard conducive to modern vehicles and driving. This is evidenced through many fatal crashes over just a few years. The river crossings of the idle and its tributaries are unsafe, with three cars colliding with the bridge on the B6387 in Gamston over four months. The bridge at Eaton has been partially demolished by vehicles on two occasions in the past two years. The bridge over the A1 on the B6387 at Doverbottom has been subject to single lane traffic controlled by lights for over a year due to its structural weakness. This junction and the slip roads may be improved as part of any development, but not the bridge as it is only supports a B road. Each property provides 6 car movements a day per house. So the "Garden Villages" would create serious congestion into Retford, onto the A1 and to other nearby towns. Over time these car movements will be doubled as most homes have additional cars as families grow up. It would seem preferable to encourage and retain industrial and commercial ventures on the two sites as it would produce less small traffic, with much of the large heavy traffic would be straight out onto the A1. The draft plan refers to other sites have been considered and discounted. If this were a true consultation, the identity should not to withheld nor should the reasons for discounting them. The area is rural in nature and all of the surrounding villages retain a rural feel. It is not possible to retain a rural nature with 4000 houses. It might be better called a new town, the two closest towns namely Retford and Tuxford had just over 9000 and 2000 properties respectively in the 2011 Census. The Council do not hold the remit for school provision. Gamston C of E and Ellesley Primary Schools are near to capacity, but serve their local communities well. Whilst the new Garden would have their own schools, it is not envisaged that these would be up and running prior the completion of the first phase of 600 properties. So where would these children go. New schools are only authorised when existing demand proves the need for investment and this is assessed at Notts County Council. This is a non political process which only becomes an obligation with certain criteria. In the meantime, the pressure would be on the existing facilities. It would appear that Retford would not be getting an appropriate share of new residential development. Development in Retford is sustainable with existing health facilities and schools. It makes sense to focus new development in urban areas such as Retford and NOT the rural villages. The suggested facilities in the new Villages do not sound congruent with other locally provided new settlements. For example, the Kings Clipstone Garden Village, does not have the economic, leisure or social facilities outlined and this is a picture across the country. Health facilities in Retford are short of staff. Both primary, secondary healthcare and mental health services are struggling to operate e.g. the Medical Imaging department in Retford only operates 2 days a week because of shortage of staff. Patients have to travel to Worksop, Doncaster and Sheffield for hospital treatment. Qualified clinical staff prefer to work in the larger hospitals. Bassetlaw hospital has difficulty in recruiting staff. It is one of the smallest hospitals in the country. Modern health workers like to be where the specialisation is, in the larger hospitals. The proposed growth as a consequence of these Garden Villages is likely to be older. It is not a good idea to put these people in Eastern and Northern Bassetlaw a long way from main health provision and hospitals.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP262	S Patience	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Note that it proposed to develop two new garden villages with further residential development anticipated beyond the plan period. The scale and timing of development proposed should be aligned with the provision of suitable water supply infrastructure and the anticipated timing of delivery of this infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more
DBLP263	L Vernon		Object to the proposed 'garden village' at Gamston Airfield. The sole criteria for locating the garden village on Gamston Airfield is that this land would "accommodate at least 1000 homes" (section 12.2). There is insufficient evidence in the Plan of a detailed analysis of the impact of the proposed 'village' on the existing communities that are most affected (Gamston and Eaton), and on the surrounding infrastructure. Have serious concerns about the increase in traffic through Eaton. The narrow, single-file bridge has been damaged by vehicles twice in the past two years. In January 2018 it was closed for 4 weeks for repairs causing significant disruption to residents, and we are waiting to find out how long it will be closed for repairs following the latest incident which resulted in a vehicle crashing through the bridge wall and ending up in the river. The bridge is not built for the volume of traffic that exits the A1 at Ellesley, travels down Jockey Lane and through Eaton towards Retford, or that travels through the village to and from Ordsall. Recent counts of traffic through Eaton show an average of 113 vehicles travelling through the village between 8 - 9am, and 117 between 4 - 5pm. Any increase in traffic from the proposed 'garden village' will further exacerbate the problem, particularly given that the Eaton side of Ordsall is expected to expand by a further 1000 houses. Not only is the bridge unsuitable for the volume of traffic, but the road through the village. There are no footpaths alongside the road, and with vehicles often parked alongside it, pedestrians have no choice but to walk into the path of the traffic. Do not allow my children to walk unaccompanied through the village for fear of an accident. As a governor at Gamston CoFE Primary School, am concerned about the impact of a new school being built in the 'garden village'. The school has the villages of Gamston, Eaton, Rockley and West Drayton as its catchment, yet an gaining population means that there are not enough primary school aged children in those villages to make the school viable, so it relies on children coming to it from outside catchment (out of its Pupil Admission Number of 14, only 1 or 2 children each year live in catchment). If another school were to open in the area, this brand new school would attract children away from Gamston School and render it unviable. It is currently operating with 99 children, and in 2017-18 had an in-year deficit of £47.7k due to rising staffing costs. In order to reduce staffing costs, in September the governors decided to replace the full-time head with an executive head shared across 3 schools, but any reduction in pupil numbers, and GAG funding, will severely impact its finances. If the 'garden village' were to be built, it would be better to expand the existing school (there is sufficient space on site for additional classrooms and parking) and ensure its future. Concerned about inaccurate facts and assumptions in the plan. It states that Gamston Airfield is in a "highly prominent location adjacent to the A1(M)" (page 93). This is inaccurate as the A1 has not been upgraded to motorway status in this area. The statements about Gamston Airport are inaccurate states that "It is currently a small scale commercial enterprise that serves the needs of local businesses". Publicly available information shows that there are 10 independent businesses based at the airport, some of which have UK and Europe-wide aviation-related contracts. The plan would lead to the direct loss of highly skilled technical jobs, but there is no evidence in the plan to demonstrate the type or amount of employment that would be created by the 'garden village' to replace this. Will have an adverse impact on the local environment and ecology. Few people have access to the airfield means that it is a haven for a variety of wildlife, including deer. The run-off will likely have an impact on the residents of Gamston, with the river idle already causing occasional flooding in the area. Current agricultural land will be lost for the development. Unclear where the residents of the 'garden village' are expected to work. With the closure of Cottam power station and uncertainty over the future of Rampton Hospital, two of the major employers in the area, there are not enough existing opportunities for employment to sustain a population growth of this size. The largest employing city in the area is Sheffield, so housing developments to the west of Bassetlaw, closer to the road and rail networks that link the district to Sheffield, would be more appropriate. The airport and associated businesses should remain, the Council should invest in the business and industrial section of the airfield to generate additional employment opportunities rather than losing them, and the agricultural land should remain for farming. Other areas in the district should be considered for development that have the infrastructure that could better cope with the demands of additional housing of this significance, particularly areas such as Shireoaks with its proximity to the M1 and the rail network.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP264	R Vernon		To develop a generally greenfield site which currently employs over 100 people cannot be justified when there are already plans for over 1000 homes in Ordsall. The proposed development will create additional strain on an already busy road network. The A1 regularly suffers from lengthy delays in the Bassetlaw area resulting in stress to the A638 and minor roads through villages adjacent to the proposed site, namely Eaton and Gamston. The environmental impact from the construction of this development will result in a greatly increased flood risk to the river idle and its tributaries. This area is currently arable land and is well drained. By concreting over a large area of land, this will create further strain on an already largely rural draining system. The creation of a new community in an otherwise peaceful and attractive rural environment is going to vastly detract from this beautiful part of North Nottinghamshire. The proposed site lacks adequate public transport, has no meaningful or quality employment opportunities and offers little in the way of integrating into an established rural community. New developments of this sort maintain a dormitory status where there is little that enhances the neighbouring area. The Council have not explored other more suitable brownfield development sites within Bassetlaw. There are potential development sites within Retford, Tuxford, and Worksop that already have more suitable amenities and infrastructure in place to serve the communities. With plans and development already taking place to a large scale in Ordsall and Retford, do not see how the Council can justify the development of housing to such a large scale at the Gamston airfield site.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP265	S Chandler		<p>There are a number of inaccuracies in the report which although minor can incorrectly influence. Gamston is well connected to the village of Ellesley, there is no direct connection. Re Gamston Airport "Given that there is only a small amount of agricultural land between the hardstanding, the majority of the site is considered to be previously developed." 400 acres or 162 Hectares is not a small amount of agricultural land. West of the site is the B6387 which is a dual carriageway, this is incorrect. The nearest villages Ellesley and Gamston provide limited employment opportunities with a shop and post office in each". Gamston has neither. There is no mention of any air quality survey been taken with the proximity of the A1 and the pollution caused and the effect this could have on the residents of the potential houses. This is important as the wind direction is mainly from the south west. With regards the "Visual receptors in the wider study area Visual receptors in the wider area (medium range up to 2km and long range over 2km) are shown in Figures 4.1.13 No mention of the village of Eaton or any properties with in the village, which is at the North end of the airport were considered thus this should be considered. The omission of this is unacceptable. The report says "Furthermore, there is a direct route to Retford along the A638." The crossing of the river in Gamston has a 90 degree bend after it and is a cause of a number of recent accidents so is not suitable for an increase of such a high level of traffic. It states that the location of the new settlement should also deliver benefits to existing rural communities, through improvements to a wider number of services, facilities and infrastructure: no consideration has been given to Eaton as it has to the village of Bothamsall. As it is located immediately north of the site it will receive a rise in through traffic from the development as residents aim to reach the A638 a significant increase in traffic may lead to the requirements of additional road works. The amount of buildings are quote in various numbers from 3001, 3758 and 4000 dwellings which will be the correct figure as this could be misleading. The balance of recommended houses on any of the developments by ADAS is flawed and doesn't correlate with the economic development in the areas put forward. Energy: no mention of ground source heating yet this is proving a method of reducing the carbon footprint at any site. The report claims "Carlton-in-Lindrick is the strongest parish out of all those reviewed, in terms of having multiple primary services plus other secondary services. Furthermore, the parish is in close proximity to several other parishes, particularly Hodsock which also contains several primary services. A new settlement could provide additional services and facilities which would be mutually beneficial for both the new and existing communities in this area, as well as enhance existing services located here. Especially if the new settlement could be located along the 2.5km road contours which link the Carlton in Lindrick and Hodsock parishes. Carlton in Lindrick also has a good road network to larger settlements such as Worksoy." So with the location between Worksoy and the development at Blyth / Harworth it would be ideally sited to ensure development of economic growth in an area in need of it. The development of two sites at Bevercoates and Carlton would have a greater benefit both enhance the economic growth of Bassetlaw and dilute the strain on the road system a super development concentrating it all in one which only has a "Rural Road network". What consideration has been given to the following "The renewed interest of the garden city/village movement has been integrated into the NPPF paragraph 52 which states that "The supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale extensions to existing villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities". And Table 1.1: Size and key characteristics of a Garden Village (Source: Places for all ages: Delivering the Future Garden Village October 201511) Size 500-5000 homes Timescales: 5-25 years Key Characteristics Expansion of existing small settlement(s) Within catchment of town or city Located on an existing transport corridor Partly or mostly self-sufficient in terms of local social infrastructure Small-scale employment, but most jobs in nearby towns and cities Land east of Carlton-in-Lindrick is undesignated land with no physical constraints. The level of services in the location is a major strength to the site as it contains the most primary services for the parishes that were reviewed. The site has good road links and access to larger areas such as Worksoy. Developing a new settlement in this location could meet several objectives for developing Garden Villages, in terms of proximity to larger settlements and self-sufficient services. Interesting choice of facilities that could provide the opportunity for community function needs within the site such as; a primary school, a GP/pharmacy, community hall, local center, library or hairdressers. Yet no mention of a senior / high school as the age of residents increase.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP265	S Chandler		<p>This site or as it should be referred to as Bunkers Hill already has a small amount of industrial buildings and a fully working airport that supports many business with about 100 people working there no consideration to developing that in conjunction with the business development aimed within Bassetlaw has been considered yet it can continue to add economic, social advantages to the area with more needs for pilots and associated services. Highways around Gamston are a rural network of minor roads so by recommending upgrading access to Brick Yard Road and Jockey Lane will need to take into consideration the effect the increased traffic movements through Eaton which has a pinch point over the river that will need addressing to deliver a stronger inter-connectivity to rural village clusters in neighbouring parishes. More effort needs to be made to replacing the industries that have been lost in Bassetlaw, mines, Paper mills, Ropeworks, Hosiery so by developing a core strategy and in turn develop the specialist business / industries you want to attract is paramount to increasing employment in the area rather than losing it to neighbouring authorities. This fundamental point is what made the towns and villages work , employment went people wanted to live nearby!!</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP267	D Backhouse	Sustrans Bassetlaw Rangers	<p>Strongly support Section 12 – the Garden Villages, paragraph 12.20, bullet points 3 & 4: connectivity between them and Retford by sustainable transport modes</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP267	D Backhouse	Sustrans Bassetlaw Rangers	<p>Strongly support Policy 12 – Transport, paragraphs a & b: pedestrian and cycle links</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP268	G Hunt		<p>The close proximity of the two sites to each other, given that a larger number of sites were originally considered. An earlier planning document from less than 10 years ago suggested development to be unsustainable in rural villages. This appears to be a U turn. Many of the proposals for the new villages appear to contradict some of the main objectives set out by the council (including pollution, transport, services, flood risk, ease of movement- detailed later in this response) Gamston does not currently have many of the essential services a new development would need. There is no gas to the village and no mains sewage system. Some years ago, Gamston was severely affected by flooding. The water stopped just short of our house. The sewage plant that waste is pumped to overflowed, causing effluent to escape and kill a number of trees in our garden. Should the garden village be built, this could potentially cause additional difficulties with surface water. Such a development would totally change the character of the area. There are less than 80 properties in Gamston. A further 600+ in the first phase would change the existing village beyond recognition. The current road system is not fit for purpose and often dangerous. When there is an accident on the A1, traffic comes through the village and causes gridlock. Similarly, roadworks in Retford cause delays on surrounding roads. The bridge over the A1 (Twyford Bridge) is currently traffic light controlled due to it being unsafe for more than one lane of traffic. There have been a number of accidents on the bridges in both Eaton and Gamston. Since Christmas, 6 vehicles have ended up in the river at Gamston at the bottom of Muttonshire Hill. As most houses are likely to own at least one or more vehicles and undertake several journeys a day, increased housing will result in more traffic, more pollution and decreased safety and ease of movement. Any development of services would be slow to appear. Residents at the consultation event cited garden villages in other areas where, 14 years on, many services promised in the original plans, had not come into fruition. Increased housing would bring with it increased need for emergency services, the infrastructure of which is insufficient. Retford no longer has a police station and the cover provided by the fire and rescue service has been dramatically reduced. There would be fragmentation of the countryside in one of the most rural areas of Nottinghamshire, a feature which currently brings visitors and tourism to the county. Would result in loss of a viable airfield as well as loss of businesses and skilled workforce currently employed at the site. This would result in them seeking employment away from the area which is in direct conflict with the proposed aims of the plan. There would be a negative impact on health and wellbeing as a result of more traffic pollution and congestion, difficulties accessing emergency services, loss of woodland, increased flood risk etc. Gamston is currently a conservation village. Whilst this proposed development lies outside of this, it seems to be in total conflict with the general character of the nearby area. Retain proposal for Bevercotes as a garden village but retain and develop Gamston Airfield more on the commercial side, creating employment opportunities and, close proximity to the A1 for vehicles will reduce traffic through residential areas. Use areas such as Shireoaks and Retford for increased housing where services such as health and retail already exist alongside a transport infrastructure. As road and rail networks are already (or are planned to be) available, this will create greater ease of movement and be more environmentally sustainable. Residents will be able to walk or cycle to these stations and be able to access areas such as Sheffield within a relatively short period of time. Look to neighbouring more urban authorities to take on some of the building allocation in order to protect valuable rural areas. Expand existing primary schools, such as Ellesley and Gamston rather than build new ones. Further develop in wards of deprivation such as Worksoy and Harworth to bring growth and wealth to these areas.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

DBLP269	D Mangnall		<p>The Council state their "main objective was to identify land for housing purposes which could form an independent settlement without the drawback of coalescence with existing settlements" [para 12.2.] however the Town and Country Planning Association [Understanding Garden Villages: An Introductory Guide; TCPA.; January 2018 p. 15] suggest it is impossible for a new community of a smaller scale to be a distinct and separate settlement: it will always be part of a hierarchy of settlements". Consequently "when considering a new community at a small scale, the right location is essential to avoid unsustainable commuting patterns". The proposed Garden Village will be a car dependent estate, apart from opportunities of local employment on the Airfield many will have to travel further afield. If the objective is that young professionals will commute to work the opposite side of the coin is that for non-car users and the elderly/disabled it will become an isolating dormitory village. The concept of creating pedestrian and cycle links [Policy 12 para 6a] that will be used between the villages is 'on the road to nowhere' – there is pedestrian access on the A638 to Rockley, Gamston and/or Eaton of similar distances to that proposed between the new villages. Rarely does the existing population of these villages walk to the next village as the route only take them into the next hamlet of houses - it is easily projected that this will be the case for the new villages and specifically for the elderly/disabled who might not be able to make use of these pedestrian and cycle links. Two car families are not uncommon and this volume of cars increases as the family's adult children seek car-dependent employment outside the settlements. The initial 625 dwellings on the Airport multiplied by a potential of two cars per family plus traffic generated by the Community Service Facilities [Policy 12; para 5a-c] and the anticipated growth of business on the 15 hectares at Gamston Airport [Policy 12; para 4] projects the possibility that the amount of cars could be well in excess of 1,200 vehicles". The number of journeys per car per day has not been included here. It is important to note that after 2035 the proposals for Gamston Airport site are 2,500 dwellings. Bassetlaw Air Quality Annual Status Report August 2016 Ref: BDC/ASR/2016 states the air quality in rural areas is good but "the main concern is the A1 which runs directly across the district from the north west to the south east, a busy trunk road which carries significant cross-country traffic, most of which does not originate from Bassetlaw or have Bassetlaw as a destination. The district therefore suffers the effects of pollution which the authority states they have no direct control over or can put measures in place to control" however, the authority does have a measure of control – the solution is not promote further traffic along the A1 route by building 4000 dwellings on the Gamston/Bevercotes site from 2018 to beyond 2035. A good number of vehicles [see "above] will require access to the A638 [toward Retford, the nearest town]. The A638 already experiences traffic problems into Retford, due to new building along London Road, these problems multiply exponentially when traffic is diverted from the A1 through Rockley/Gamston/Eaton after accidents and other events. Some cars and lorries coming from Markham Moor onto the A638 via Rockley/Gamston/Eaton toward Retford continue to exceed the speed limit, there is no paving on the left side coming out of Gamston toward Retford and the paving on the right side is too narrow in places and ends at Eaton resulting in the need to cross the road to connect with paving on the opposite side. It would not be a safe road to rely on as a cycle link from the Airport to Retford. The Plan identifies the close transport links to the East Coast Mainline. With increasing rail costs and railway parking charges at Retford Station ranging from £4-£5.50/ per day it may be uneconomical to travel from the village to the station by car in order to link to larger towns and cities for employment. Currently accessibility and connectivity from the Airfield to the Rail Station using public transport would involve a 15 minute walk to the bus stop on the A638, a bus to London Road and a 0.711 mile walk to the station [14 minutes at a walking speed of 3mph], making it less accessible than implied. The loss of airport related employment [para 12.9] is deeply concerning. Retention and growth of existing established businesses in this area is essential alongside new commerce – waiting for potential investment and growth of new businesses on the 15 hectares site at Gamston, which may not happen at all, is a risky strategy. The Governments ambition for more housing in addition the housing market stakeholders requirement for a return on their investment presents a conflict that does not sit easily with the ethos of Garden Villages [Understanding Garden Villages : An Introductory Guide; TCPA.; January 2018]. The Councils plan for the development of Community Services and Facilities [Policy 12; para 5a-c] is not reassuring when we learn of the deeper crisis facing the NHS and Teaching professions.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP270	D Troop		<p>At 1.4 the draft LP sets out the intention of the consultation paper stating: "the principles contained in it are not fixed and we welcome alternative ideas suggesting how the issues outlined might be addressed" However, there is a clear inference at 1.10 and throughout the document that the LPA's mind is already set re: garden village delivery. Garden village development should not have its own policy, garden village delivery should not be a Strategic Objective, garden village delivery is merely a proposed delivery mechanism at this stage. The wording used in the "Vision" for the new Garden Villages belies the vanity project status of the proposal and the flowery rhetoric continues for the entirety of page 90. Throughout the totality of the 17year draft plan, 2018-2035, the district is proposing a mere 1777 units across 73 settlements. The findings of the 2017 LAA should be heeded and settlements with primary schools given a level of growth of 30% leaving those of the 73 without primary schools at 10% growth. Policy wording will be that an average of 20% growth is awarded across the eligible (73) rural settlements.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP272	Anonymous		<p>Objection to new villages: There is more than enough new building going on in Retford - we are swamped with it and people are having difficulty selling their older property in consequence.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP272	Anonymous		<p>Objection to new villages: Appears to be a case of putting the cart before the horse in the fact that no industrial development is being planned alongside it. Question - who is going to want to move there.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP272	Anonymous		<p>Objection to new villages: It might appear to be a good idea to site the villages near the A1 which might benefit one person in the household but there is nowhere to go beyond the A1 so most people will gravitate to Retford on quite unsuitable roads. I understand that Jockey Lane is being suggested as the road of choice out of the Gamston airfield site which would mean that they would go through Ordsall a high density residential area with houses with no garages and therefore on road parking, or along Ordsall High Street equally blessed with on road parking, which means that through Eaton village would probably be their chosen route. We already suffer with short cutters in abundance speeding through the dangerously curved village. The bridge has just been seriously damaged again. Ordsall High Street and Eaton will bring them onto London Road which is already oversaturated with traffic and with more houses being built at the moment which will bring further traffic chaos.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP272	Anonymous		<p>Objection to new villages: Gamston airport has had a subsidence problem a number of years ago and I am presuming Bevercotes Colliery will have the same. The subsidence may have been seen to but insurance companies tend to have long memories and many people will be uncertain about buying property where there has been a history of subsidence .</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP272	Anonymous		<p>Objection to new villages: Gamston Airport. It seems to me wrong to close a viable airport to make way for housing. Surely the owner should be encouraged to develop industrial units on site which could be transferred by air instead of using the already congested roads. Money talks! We have already lost two market gardens to the lucrative house building industry When we come out of Europe and are being encouraged to grow more of our own food they will be missed.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP272	Anonymous		<p>In relation to the new villages and their impact on Retford: It mentioned in the pamphlet that in case of extra railway travellers something would have to be done with the area surrounding the station. I don't know what other than knocking houses down. Having the most expensive station carpark on the line doesn't help matters and sometimes one can't even park to buy a ticket or meet a passenger. The surrounding residents suffer enormously with on road parking. No room for any more. Seems they don't run a bus from the town to the station.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

DBLP272	Anonymous		I realise that my voice is very small and probably of little consequence but being a home owner in Eaton I would ask that when/if the plans get under way that you find a way to secure the road through our village from further traffic.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP274	D Bowness		If the garden village on Gamston Airfield was to get the go ahead, is an opportunity for an Anaerobic Digestion Plant to be built to service the site. Interested in AD plants having supplied feedstocks to existing local plants. As a local farmer in Gamston, have the land that could be used to grow and store crops that could feed such a plant, and may have funds to help build and operate such a site in the future. An AD plant would be able to supply homes and businesses with a clean, renewable and carbon neutral source of heat and power. This could be heat from the process itself fed into a district heating system, electricity generated onsite from the gas produced, or even the gas fed into a local gas grid and piped around the site to each property. Perhaps there could be some link up with the sewage treatment facility giving enormous environmental benefits. Would such a scheme fit in the proposed plans? In full support of the proposed Garden Villages. Concerned about any extra traffic between them and Retford that might be generated. In Gamston, the T junction where the B6387 meets the A638 is a poor junction due to reduced visibility in both direction. A mini roundabout would really improve this junction. As an added benefit, a mini roundabout would act as a natural speed reducer on the main road that passes through the village. This still means all the traffic will pass through the village so a Bypass built from the northern end of Gamston Airfield heading east over a new bridge over the River Idle and joining the A638 with a roundabout halfway between Gamston and Eaton. A Bypass that would serve both Garden Villages would be to build a road from the tight bend on the B6387 at the top of Muttonshire Hill heading north before heading east, again over a new bridge over the River Idle and joining the A638 as above between Eaton and Gamston. Building a bypass would protect both Gamston and Eaton from extra traffic, and reduce the pressure on the existing river crossings in Gamston, Eaton and Ordsall. This is especially important to Eaton as recent vehicle damage to this bridge has been very disruptive and is also unsuitable for HGVs.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP275	J Howe		Object to the garden villages at Gamston airport and Bevercotes. The road system is not fit for purpose. When there is an accident on the A1, traffic comes through the village and can cause gridlock. There are less than 80 properties at present. The proposed development will change the character of the area. Gamston does not have many of the essential services that a new development would require. Existing businesses operating from Gamston airfield would close or relocate, creating unemployment which is contrary to the stated objects in the plan.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP276	S and Z Venables		The Plan and New Settlement Study have glaring inconsistencies re Bevercotes/Gamston site being the best approach for housing and growth. Misrepresentation and misleading justification show blatant disregard for the existing communities in Gamston, Ellesley, Bothamsall as well as belittling the national significance and economic opportunities afforded to Bassetlaw by the operating Airfield and associated businesses. Principles of the Garden City/Village movement aimed to find potential sites which 'have the opportunity to support an independent and sustainable community which also has minimal impacts on its surrounding environment' [BNSSM page 3] and in relation to NPPF as well 'it will also be important that the size of any new settlement respects the relationship with existing settlements and to avoid coalescence and negative impacts on existing communities' [BNSSM page 10] To build a new 'garden village' of 2500 houses within 100m of the historic village of Gamston, which only has 104 dwellings, is preposterous. The impact of residents and employees would increase the traffic exponentially, along failing and inadequate infrastructure and with a second site of 1500 houses less than 2km away will heighten this negative impact. 'Garden Villages' are Urban Sprawl/glorified housing estates with a nicer label. The plan indicates that access is via the A1 or Jockey Lane, but no mention how vehicles travel from the existing access to the airfield via the B6387. This single carriageway goes through Gamston and adjoins the A638 at Gamston. The B6387 carries most of the traffic between Ollerton, Nottingham and Retford. Live in Gamston on the B6387 by the tight bend adjacent to the bridge, in the last 13 years have seen multiple road traffic accidents with cars hitting the bridge, scraping the house and ending up in the River. Highways and Notts County Council does nothing to make this road safer. Leaving our drive is perilous with visibility poor. Walking the children to school involves crossing fast traffic and using public footpaths which is difficult and dangerous. The developments will increase traffic - measures should be put in place to eradicate traffic or calm it. Construction Traffic will make worse the poor road conditions. Most homes own 2 cars = 6 local journeys a day, an additional 12,000 journeys per day in phase 1. Lifting to 48,000 residential journeys once complete. Business and construction traffic additional. The Twyford Bridge on the A1 is structurally unsound and needs repair/replacing due to the scale and mass of the developments. Highways/Council need to fix this junction urgently and not tie it to the development. To be told at the Consultation that "if I wanted the A1 junction to be done I need to have the 2 garden villages to pay for it" was unprofessional. The A1 is a commuter belt and this 50mph zone is an accident black spot. When there is a problem on the A1 all traffic travels through Retford by the B6837 or A638. This gridlocks Gamston, Rockley, Eaton and Retford. Easy access to the A1 will make these commuter villages. This does not support economic growth in Bassetlaw due to the infrastructure currently in place, and will not deliver growth. People will commute to other areas daily - there is limited employment in Retford and more job-losses in the future, people will need to travel from these sites. Bus and Rail facilities have been declining to and from Retford. There are only 10 services a day from Retford to London. Car parking at the station is inadequate. The local train services to Sheffield and Lincoln are infrequent and are not easy to switch modes to get to work. The increasing rail fares are prohibitive (£11,500 annually to London). Local journeys (South Yorkshire, Lincoln) would be better served by driving due to journey time to the station, station parking and station facilities. To say that Gamston is well served by buses is incorrect. The 37/X37 is the only stops at the village hourly and only travels between Newark and Retford, not the places listed. The first service into Retford arrives at 9am (too late for work) and leaves at 6.20pm. The Study states that 'Retford is accessible within 30 minutes through a combination of walking and public transport' [BNSSM page 35]. This is not in government guidelines. Walking from Gamston to Retford town centre is a minimum 5km walk and would expect residents to walk to the bus stop in Gamston in 16 minutes (1.8km), along poor footpaths by a busy A638, and Markham Moor to Whitehouses doesn't have a dedicated cycle lane. There are 2 small primary schools in Gamston and Ellesley, which are near capacity so residents will have problems accessing school places at the outset. This is managed by Notts County Council. Gamston school is accessed off the busy A638 with limited parking and pedestrians have to cross the busy road without assistance. Should additional places be required whilst a 'new school' was being developed it may lead to children being taught in temporary accommodation, which is unacceptable. The Study states incorrectly that 'Ellesley and Gamston provide limited employment opportunities with a shop and post office in each' and that a 'medical centre and a pharmacy' can be found [BNSSM page 89] - this is not the case. Only 1 exists – the post office in Ellesley is a pop-up in the Memorial Hall on a Monday and a Friday. Hardly adequate for the additional residents and businesses.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP276	S and Z Venables		Woefully underestimated the flood risk to neighbouring waterways and Gamston lowlands. The development is not at risk of flood due to its elevated position but the land to the south-eastern side has a significant fall to the River Idle lowlands/Wetlands and is constantly in flood. Any changes to the surface water runoff from the development would impact these areas, cause a significant risk increase in Flood Zone 3 at Gamston and Eaton and overload the infrastructure in Retford, as experienced in 2007 (with central Retford under water). Our property sits in Zone 3, not on mains drainage and served by Septic Tanks. Any flooding to properties would risk sewage and/or other pollutants entering the watercourse. Bevercotes would discharge into the River Maun/Meden which feed the River Idle, adding further impact. The remediation of the sites would require significant measures to 'wash' soil of contaminants (arsenic within the pit waste) which will enter the watercourse. Would be a significant impact on Air Quality, Noise and Light Pollution through additional traffic and construction works. Light spill will be considerable to the detriment of wildlife and residents. Gamston is a Conservation village and the development will be visible from more properties than the Study indicates. Photos of the site were not taken from Gamston. The nearest property in Gamston is only 35m away from the site, not 500m as stated in the desktop study. Recreational space will be created which include lakes in the central hub. During the summer have a significant mosquito problem in and around Gamston and the wider area, reaching into Retford, Tuford and Worksop. This will exacerbate the issue for residents. Existing local services are at crisis point with Retford Police station closed, Fire and Ambulance services struggling and rural communities will be harder to access. Bassetlaw Hospital is experiencing significant cuts. To propose large developments would pull on resources in the area. The loss of the operating Airfield would be felt locally and nationally. There are well established businesses on-site and despite the study noting that there would be numerous job losses it seems that the loss of highly skilled, quality jobs is acceptable. These people moved to the area, have enhanced our community with their diversity. Many of the people own houses, live in the community and attend schools. This is what the local plan sets out to achieve. The council would be displacing them, causing considerable harm and would take the bespoke professional skills that they bring. The Airport serves more than just a few 'rich people parking their planes'. The children's Air Ambulance is there. As the largest private Airfield in the UK Gamston has economic potential for aviation-based companies - this must not be over-looked. The airspace above the Airport protects Retford and the surrounding villages from low flying, frequent flights to Doncaster Sheffield Airport. Without this there will be an increase in planes at lower altitudes, adding to noise and air pollution. Currently it has more plane manoeuvres daily than Fittingley and apart from a few larger planes being noisy for a brief time the Airport and local communities co-exist well. Airports have been classified as 'Brownfield sites' since 2003. The site also consists of Class 2 Farming land. The Study uses Class 2 land to exclude some sites. Should changes to local infrastructure be necessary the majority will be over Class 2 land. The airport and farmland only came forward due to the lobbying of landowners to develop and profit – and the Airport owner has not marketed the Airfield for sale as an existing or growing entity, only as land for housing. This is disconcerting - there would be interested parties that would buy and develop it as a aviation hub creating more jobs in the area. The Airport should remain operational and the diverseness of operations should be protected. BDC is 7.9 years ahead of Government targets for Housing so In-fill would be preferred, enhancing rural areas in small scale. Development of In-fill currently fulfils the needs of the NPPF without the need to build the Garden Villages.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP277	Mrs J Mangnall		<p>The Council state their "main objective was to identify land for housing purposes which could form an independent settlement without the drawback of coalescence with existing settlements" [para 12.2.] however the Town and Country Planning Association [Understanding Garden Villages: An Introductory Guide; January 2018 p. 15] suggest it is impossible for a new community of a smaller scale to be a distinct and separate settlement: it will always be part of a hierarchy of settlements". Consequently "when considering a new community at a small scale, the right location is essential to avoid unsustainable commuting patterns" The Village will be car dependent, apart from opportunities of local employment on the Airfield many will have to travel further afield. If the objective is that young professionals will commute for non-car users and the elderly/disabled it will be an isolating dormitory village. Creating pedestrian and cycle links [Policy 12 para 6a] between the villages is 'on the road to nowhere' – there is pedestrian access on the A638 to Rockley, Gamston and/or Eaton. Rarely do people walk to the next village as the route takes them to the next hamlet - this will be the case for the new villages and specifically for the elderly/disabled who might not be able to use the links. Two car families are not uncommon and this increases as adult children seek car-dependent employment outside the settlements. The initial 625 dwellings multiplied by a two cars per family plus traffic generated by the Community Facilities [Policy 12; para 5a-c] and the growth of business [Policy 12; para 4] means the amount of cars could be in excess of 1,200 vehicles*. The number of journeys per car per day has not been included. Bassetlaw Air Quality Annual Status Report August 2016 Ref: BDC/ASR/2016 states the air quality in rural areas is good but "the main concern is the A1 which runs directly across the district from the north west to the south east, a busy trunk road which carries significant cross-country traffic, most of which does not originate from Bassetlaw or have Bassetlaw as a destination. The district suffers the effects of pollution which the authority have no direct control over or can put measures in place to control" however, the authority does have a measure of control – not promote further traffic along the A1 by building 4000 dwellings. A good number of vehicles will require access to the A638 to Retford, the nearest town. The A638 experiences traffic problems into Retford, due to building along London Road, these multiply when traffic is diverted from the A1 after accidents. Vehicles coming from Markham Moor onto the A638 via Rockley/Gamston/Eaton toward Retford exceed the speed limit, there is no paving on the left side from Gamston to Retford and the paving on the right is too narrow and ends at Eaton resulting in the need to cross the road. It would not be safe to rely on as a cycle link from the Airport to Retford. The Plan refers to close links to the East Coast Mainline. With increasing rail costs and railway parking charges at Retford Station (£4-£5.50/ per day) it may be uneconomical to travel from the village to the station by car. Connectivity from the Airfield to the Rail Station using public transport would involve a 15 minute walk to the bus stop on the A638, a bus to London Road and a 0.711 mile walk to the station [14 minutes walking speed of 3mph], making it less accessible than implied. The loss of airport related employment [para 12.9] is concerning. Retention and growth of existing established businesses in this area is essential – waiting for investment and growth of new businesses is a risky strategy. The Governments ambition for housing and the housing providers requirement for a return presents a conflict that does not sit easily with the ethos of Garden Villages [Understanding Garden Villages : An Introductory Guide; TCPA.; January 2018]. The Councils plan for the development of Community Services and Facilities [Policy 12; para 5a-c] is not reassuring when we learn of the deeper crisis facing the NHS and Teaching professions.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP278	J McCombe		<p>Not opposed to development of more housing - would prefer the site to be smaller and on the Bevercotes site and not both because Bevercotes is in need of major rejuvenation. It's used for illegal raves and illegal motor cross. Live in Bothamsall and have ridiculous amounts of traffic using the village daily as a commuting rat run from Mansfield to the A1 and vice versa. Fear what would happen if 1000s of houses were to be passed. The roads are in a sorry state, particularly on the stretch coming out of the village to the A614. The traffic shoots through, most not abiding to the speed limit. The pavements are very narrow and it's dangerous. Fear for my children's safety. It's tricky coming out of my drive which is after a slight bend. Who will want to live in these houses? The facilities around us are limited. The access to and from the A1 is dangerous. Not opposed to a smaller development if road infrastructure could be considered to divert the commuters to the A1 / A614 via another route and not through Bothamsall.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP279	S Roberson	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Am an engineer and flight inspector of Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd at Gamston Airport providing flight inspection and validation services, navigational aids and communications equipment as well as airfield lighting systems, to civilian and military customers worldwide. Radiola has seen a steady growth over the last three years from 2 employees to 8 salaried staff maintaining more than 4 contracts UK wide and more contracts worldwide. What is the purpose of shutting down a working airport, to build 1000 required houses when there is room for 1,125 homes at a vacant site used for illegal raves and fly-tipping? "The aim of the study was to find an area of land which would meet the District's housing needs by being able to accommodate at least 1000 homes on a site size ranging from 50ha-150ha. The main objective was to identify land for housing purposes which could form an independent settlement without the drawback of coalescence with existing settlements. Bassetlaw's rural communities represent almost a third of the district's population, therefore careful consideration was given to identifying locations that would both benefit from significant investment and provide wider strategic benefits." (12.2 Bassetlaw Plan). It is clear that there is a demand for new housing in Bassetlaw. The numbers are shown and are understandable. The plan shows that 1000 homes are required over those planned in existing urban areas. The Garden Villages seems to be the answer. Doubt the need to create two new villages to provide them. Bevercotes and Gamston Airport, have sufficient space for over 1000 new homes. Why is there a need to spread 1000 homes over two sites one of which is "nestled in the gentle undulations of lush, green farmland"? (Strange words to describe "brownfield land"). The aim of the plan was never to find two sites. Why did that change? Understand that the answer is because, after the plan period there may be a need for a further 3000 homes. This seems to be planning outside of the remit of the plan. Should we set aside the A1 for the year 2198? At what point does planning beyond the plan period cut off?</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP279	S Roberson	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>This will close down a business area serving Bassetlaw with more than 100 "high quality" jobs, to create a housing estate and no jobs. "The delivery of the new settlements must include new employment opportunities to ensure they are truly sustainable villages, not simply large housing estates. Therefore, the expectation is for the new villages to deliver at least 15 hectares of employment land." 12.22 DBP. The new settlements will require demolition of buildings and hangar space serving employment to over 100 people to be replaced by 15 hectares of empty land. Land which for the next five years can be protected by Bassetlaw so that only new businesses providing "high quality" employment can build there and then the rules will be relaxed and with such fantastic links to the A1, 15 hectares of warehousing will arrive. Working in a warehouse is not as high quality as aircraft pilots, technicians, engineers, operations staff, flight inspectors, ground handlers, fire officers and air traffic controllers. New businesses tend to be small and do not have the capital to build premises. It is difficult to see how empty land constitutes employment opportunities being created. If the plan is about efficiency, then it should develop Bevercotes and encourage the airport based businesses to flourish and grow? "The present use of the site is considered to be an inefficient use of land which could otherwise be developed for a use which is in much need" (12.10 DBPP1) As a working runway, some land is used for aircraft to take off and land, this is an efficient use of a runway, the hangarage is used for aircraft storage and maintenance, efficient at the airport, the offices is used by office workers, employed by companies based at an airport. The rest is farmland. This also seems relatively efficient. Gamston is a working airport for business, leisure, flight training and the Children's Air Ambulance, home to 10 independent aviation-related businesses, providing employment for around 100 people, training facilities for emergency services as well as having a large acreage of productive arable agricultural land. It is hard to see how 15 hectares of wasteland is more efficient from a business point of view. It is also hard to see how 375 homes on a site spacious enough for 1,125 is efficient when Bevercotes is described as a "former spoil heap" and "large parts of the site remain open and are frequently accessed for informal recreation and subject to occurrences of antisocial behaviour, including raves, fly-tipping and off-road vehicle use." Selective disregard for the NPPF. The plan fails to mention its statutory duty under NPPF Paragraph 104(f) which requires that Planning Policies should: "recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy." Have been unable to find any "evidence" that it conforms with the NPPF. The proposal would see the loss of five pilot training schools reducing the "high quality" employment in the area and in the UK. Boeing predict that an additional 800,000 pilots will be required worldwide in the next 20 years. Because of a more advantageous tax regime towards flight training in Spain, and a much more proactive approach to General Aviation in the USA, a high proportion of pilot training is being drawn outside of the UK. There is a national shortage of flying instructors as well as pilots and the Plan will wipe out 5 pilot/flight training schools. These cannot be relocated because they require an airfield and other airfields have established flying/pilot training schools. The current size of these businesses suggests they are unlikely to relocate even if there was a similar sized airport with limited flying schools anywhere in the UK. "Whilst development of the site would result in a loss of airport-related employment, the new village would provide opportunities for new employment." (12.10 DBPP1). With continuing growth at a greater rate expected and an increase in owned aircraft underway, Radiola will be forced to relocate out of the area. With no similar sized airfields in Bassetlaw this "high quality" employer will be forced to offer employees relocation or redundancy. DEA Aviation Ltd, operate and maintain a fleet of 10 "Special Mission" aircraft at Gamston. One of their primary roles is to provide Airborne Intelligence, Surveillance & Reconnaissance services to the Government and European Agencies, some of which are related to national security. DEA Aviation Ltd has invested heavily in Gamston to keep pace with the future growth potential in the Airborne ISR market. DEA have more than 70 people, most are salaried and in highly technical and professional roles, DEA will relocate out of the area. Other companies at Gamston Airport: five training schools, airport staff consisting of café staff, Ramp handlers, ATC controllers, Fire service personnel, and various other personnel crucial to the operation of the airport, Gemstone aviation, Conrail Flight Services, and the potential new tenants involved in anti-drone technology for airport security who are due to open soon. These provide "High Quality" employment to more than 100 personnel, with the potential to grow - fitting with the salaried, professional, technical employment.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP279	S Roberson	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	<p>Refers to the All Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation website where they 'promote the objective – as set out by British Government – of making the United Kingdom the best country in the world for General Aviation, and to stimulate interest in the sector. Our goal is to ensure that General Aviation inspires both current and future generations to take up science, technology, engineering and mathematics, thereby creating high-tech jobs and growth in all nations and regions of our economy. In order to achieve this objective, the All-Party Parliamentary Group believes that a network of General Aviation airfields must be protected and enhanced by the government.'"Put simply, the importance of General Aviation to boosting scientific, technological, engineering and mathematical (STEM) skills in the wider economy cannot be overestimated."(http://www.generalaviationappg.uk)The closure of Gamston would force these from any presence in Bassetlaw. The plan refers to how it will encourage employment in Bassetlaw, including "high quality" employment, but it does not define "high quality" employment, how it will encourage any sort of employment, or what sort of businesses will be encouraged. "Promoting economic prosperity through the delivery of high-quality employment space and advanced communications technology, capitalising on the sites' location adjacent to the A1 and to the south of Retford." (12.20 DBPP1) "As these settlements will be delivered over a long period of time, it is expected that they will need to be designed to meet emerging working practices. It is expected that there will be a higher percentage of home/flexible working that will drive the need for higher capacity, future adaptable communications infrastructure to be designed into the schemes from the outset." (12.23 DBPP1). High-speed internet is referred to as being the encouragement for new businesses. Relying on the new residents to bring their own employment with them, employing one or two personnel at best. The assumption is that that they will be high-quality jobs. "The delivery of the new settlements must include new employment opportunities to ensure they are truly sustainable villages, not simply large housing estates. Therefore, the expectation is for the new villages to deliver at least 15 hectares of employment land. This growth will help meet the requirement across the district, as identified by the 2018 Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA)." (12.22 DBPP1) It is understood that this is a very proactive plan for new businesses. Is there any way that Bassetlaw can ensure that only, or at least some, businesses offering "high quality" employment will be permitted to build on the 15 hectares? Will utilities be built into the land left aside? Is there any guarantee that the businesses will not be warehousing, lorry parks, factories, "capitalising on opportunities associated with close proximity to the A1 corridor." (12.18 DBPP1). The answers are not forthcoming, or flatly in the negative. There is no realistic suggestions which come close to replacing more than 100 salaried jobs. Especially when compared to the STEM skilled jobs provided through the continued operation of the general aviation airport supporting more than 10 independent businesses which is threatened.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

DBLP280	Mr & Mrs J Robinson		The proposed plan will create more traffic on the B6387 through Gamston on Muttonshire Hill / Rectory Lane which includes Hather Close to the A638 Gt North Road. Hather Close occupants are all senior citizens, do they really need to put up with more traffic. If Commercial units are built how will the B6387 through Gamston cope, is not a good road for HGV traffic now so what will it be like. The volume of traffic including HGV's is quite busy during peak times now, so the extra traffic will be worse, traffic from the A1 already cuts through Gamston. Build new houses but give a new access road to the A638.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP281	B Lange	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Appreciate the logic for Policy 12 and broadly welcome the development principles. The proposed cycling and walking route between the 2 villages and across the A1 needs careful design to be attractive and (perceived to be) safe, and overall the A1 needs to be 'tamed', otherwise community severance is built into the design. It is also our view that Bassetlaw should consider the creation of a Green Belt around the settlements to prevent future sprawl and encroachment into the countryside. The creation of new Green Belt around large new housing developments is supported in NPPF paragraph 72.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP282	D Garside		Object to the two garden villages. The effect of the combination and interconnection of these two major developments is to build a town in a rural setting. 4000 houses in total compared to about 7000 for Retford. The nature of the area will change from rural to a sprawling conurbation stretching from Retford. People in the new town will have to commute because there are few local jobs for them. The roads and infrastructure are woefully inadequate e.g. one lane Twyford Bridge, access to A1. 90 degree turn over the Idle into Gamston, the congestion in Retford and the road leading to it – not to mention the local facilities. Your objective must be to develop and conserve the nature of the area. This would be possible developing Bevercotes but combining this with a huge development at Gamston destroys a pleasant area and leads to a deterioration in quality of life. If Gamston is no longer to be used as an airport it should revert to agricultural use combined with industrial/commercial development on its fringes. The area cannot support thousands of people – the garden village at Bevercotes will be enough to challenge facilities, infrastructure and the nature of the area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP285	A Webber		Object to the plan to close Gamston Retford airport. Am a businessman and private pilot and often use the airfield to travel to business meetings. Gamston is a real gem of an airfield with superb facilities and without it the local area would be losing a great asset and would also be cutting itself off from the rest of the country. There aren't any new airfield being developed in the UK and the existing infrastructure is vital to the training of new commercial pilots which are in ever increasing demand. It is ludicrous that airfields are being closed across the country in order to build new houses, at the expense of reducing our transport infrastructure. If this trend continues we will be driving commercial pilots abroad to do their training, and cutting off local economies from the rest of the country.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP292	969674		No support for any policy apart from delivering new employment land. A better plan would be to keep the main runway Hangars and dispersal area and develop the far side of the airfield with more leisure facilities. There is already a shortage of schools, Doctors surgeries and employment around Retford. Where are the occupants of these houses going to go? Where are the occupants going to come from?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP293	969694		No support for any policy. The loss of the airport is an outrage, I am completely opposed to it. It is well used land and allows businesses to prosper in the area. A few corner shops won't replace the cumulative loss of the airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP294	969747		No support for any policy apart from those which seek to address climate change. The loss of the airport would be disastrous. Gamston Airfield is a brilliant facility for the community. The Council should be proud of it and not destroying livelihoods and history. This smacks a simple land and money grabbing exercise.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP295	969800		No support for any policy. Lots of businesses depend on Gamston Airport and it should not be built on.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP296	975737		Support for 2 new villages but concern about the location. The sites for the new villages are not well served by transport. It would be costly for people on low incomes to live there due to the cost of transport. Anti-social behaviour could become a problem. There is a lack of job opportunities in this area. It could result in migration from other areas, which wouldn't help Bassetlaw.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP297	975757		No support for any policy apart from those which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. The irrevocable loss of this important airfield would be a travesty. The whole idea of classification as brownfield was a mistake and this is an opportunistic affront to the preservation of our land and our culture, commerce and aviation. Find other land.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP299	975914		No support for any policy. Opposed to a new village at Gamston Airport. New housing should be directed towards Worksop, and Harworth & Bircotes. Building more houses increases climate change. New homes need maintaining and so does the infrastructure (roads, street lighting etc). New homes are likely to increase the amount of traffic and destroy the countryside and wildlife.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP301	977042		No support for the policy. Who will live there?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP303	978627		Opposed to the proposition to create a garden village on the Gamston Airport which is the only suitable general aviation airfield for hundreds of people in the region who fly either for business or recreational purposes. Closing the airport would be a significant loss to the people whose aircraft are based at Gamston but the people wishing to fly to it. There has been a steady reduction of general aviation airfields over the last few decades and, in years to come will regret not having the facility to fly or even train new pilots. In terms of suitability for housing, the airport site is very close to and downwind of the A1 which carries high volumes of noisy heavy freight traffic. This would not create a good environment to live. Quite clearly the people recommending conversion to housing have never lived near a busy trunk road - it is a constant 24 hour source of intrusive noise and foul air! Any housing development would consequently be of low quality and not produce the benefits claimed.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP305	986296		Object to the closure of Gamston Airport. Surely there is some where else to build the houses it seems ridiculous to close a busy airport and shut down several thriving businesses I will not support any closure of Retford Gamston Airport	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP306	986333		Object to the closure of Gamston Airport. Gamston airport is a hugely important place as it stands. It provides work for many people including a cafe for visitors which is often used by cyclists as well as aviators. It should be encouraged to expand not be lost to infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP307	986349		No support for the closure of Gamston Airport. No support for 2 new villages. There are many empty properties which could be utilised. It would it would destroy existing facilities and farmland/forestry.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP308	986480		Object to a new village at Gamston Airport. Gamston airport is a fantastic asset to the area it provides over 100 highly skilled jobs. The flight training schools are second to none. Without any other local airports in the region that can accommodate what Gamston does it should not close. Other brown field sites are available locally. This is a thriving airport that provides everything that's needed. Please do not close it.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP310	986858		No support for the 2 villages. The airport is a large employer (which has been drastically underestimated by your proposal). This plan would also reduce the availability of pilot training facilities locally to virtually zero.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP311	986993		No support for the closure of Gamston Airport. Gamston air port provides over 100 skilled jobs, it's a thriving airport which has 5 Flight schools and a busy restaurant. I completely object to the proposed plan to build plans it will make flying in this region very limited. It would displace multiple businesses and employees and leave the region without any local airstrip. Gamston have a fantastic reputation both in the UK and Europe.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP313	987594		No support for the closure of Gamston Airport. Save the airport local jobs for local people	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP314	987642		You state that the airport is a brownfield site yet there are over 400 acres of land being farmed. Item 1. Good Quality Design, this is something I would suggest should be provided on any new build construction within Bassetlaw and doesn't require the creation of Garden Villages to deliver this. The objective of promoting a locally character through distinctive features can not be measured on either site. Item 2. There seems to be a mismatch between the size of the 2 proposed Garden Village sites and the targets set out in the draft plan. Total combined site area is 233 hectares. Plan states - 1000 houses by 2035 = 30 hectares; Employment land = 15 hectares; Total = 45 hectares Leaving - 188 hectares of allocated Garden Village land for what? Item 3. At what point would this be included as it needs to specified time line to ensure that it meets your requirements. Item 4. Employment is indeed key to creating a sustainable community, however does the site for the Bevercotes garden village not already have the required planning for the uses proposed for the 15 hectares of employment land the focus of which is now proposed to switch to the Gamston Airfield Site? Therefore how is Bevercotes site being classed as a garden village as it doesn't meet the government requirements. If the demand for industrial site at Bevercotes has not been demonstrated to date it would suggest that there are other factors that are deterring investors in this sector and I would be gravely concerned if the proposed Garden Villages were being used to extract monies from developers for highway improvements that can't be afforded through other means. Item 5 As item 3 no timeline or at what point would this be included to ensure the plan is being delivered as it needs to specified time line to ensure that it meets your requirements. Item 6 Why Eaton and Elkesley not to Ollerton? No mention of the improvements to the surrounding roads and specifically river crossings in Gamston, Eaton and Ordsall or the A1 junction. Also, section 19 page 127 - 130 refers to the - Community Infrastructure Levy CIL which the proceeds of the levy will be spent on infrastructure across the District rather than ring fenced to ensure that the infrastructure required in the nearby area directly relating to improvements required to cope with the increase in traffic and people.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP315	987680		Do not support Gamston proposal. Gamston Airfield is a credit to our region, it provides a service to the community beyond just light aircraft coming and going. In a time where these facilities that support the national infrastructure are under threat, we should as a community do everything to retain them. Once lost, they will never be replaced.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP316	987785		No support for Gamston. There are other sites that can be used without destroying a thriving airfield, leading to job losses and business closures. This proposal clearly does not safeguard the transport infrastructure as it will destroy an airfield which is part of that infrastructure. Aviation is part of our heritage. It provides jobs, trading for prospective pilots who can have careers in the aviation industry. Airfields are vital parts of any areas infrastructure and should not be seen as an easy option for developments.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP317	987880		Support for the 2 new villages. I think it's a good idea, they will have easy access to the A1. They will take the pressure off Ordsall and Retford as the roads are already far to busy at certain times of the day. If you build at Gamston and Bevercoat's will there be shop's, Doctor's, maybe a school?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP318	987892		Support. I would like to say that the two proposed villages are a good idea. They will take the traffic away from the roads in Retford. They both have access to the A1.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP319	987959		No support for Gamston. You need to contact the APG for General Aviation as the value of small airports and airfields has been realised. The is a large group of MPs within all parties involved. It is chaired by Grant Chapps.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP320	988034		No support for Gamston. I do not agree with the destruction of Retford Gamston airport for houses - there is plenty of land around the area which could be used that will not destroy businesses and increase unemployment. I do not support the proposal because the land being chosen provides employment already to a large number of people	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP322	988044		No support for the Gamston proposal. Proposed site of village to replace Gamston airport is unnecessary. Alternative brown field sites are available. Retford also has new housing developments being constructed already without the need to threaten the businesses and flying training at Gamston. You will destroy existing successful and highly skilled engineering jobs at Gamston to create low quality jobs in this proposal. Removing a successful local airport is not a clever transport plan. Limiting transport arrangements to hub airports further afield is shortsighted.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP324	988050		Oppose Gamston Airport proposal. You're taking away land that is already used as an airport which provides highly skilled employment and services for local and national people. You're planning on taking away a key transport hub to build houses. I don't see how that is a good policy to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP325	988054		Object/No support for the loss of Gamston. The loss of Gamston Airport will have a significant impact on regional and national flying, flying training, and airport infrastructure, which is already severely lacking. There are significantly better places that can be used other than Gamston Airport. I understand there is a need for new homes but there are better places than a thriving airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP326	988057		Do not support Gamston. Gamston is a thriving GA airfield with recreation and training for future pilots. There is employment and enjoyment and it should be kept open. We also need business and we need to train future pilots for the airlines.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP328	988061		Object/do not support. I object to the proposals to create a new village at the Gamston airport location. This will have a detrimental effect on both the local and wider community. The airport has excellent facilities and is used frequently. For a local airport it has a long runway and can accommodate private jets & vintage aircraft, it has facilities to refuel all aircraft and is used frequently by the medical helicopters. The airport has a very good restaurant and employs many staff i the restaurant as well as the fire brigade, control tower, auxiliary facilities and flight school. The airport acts as a focal point for the surrounding villages and has in the past also hosted charity events, and private vintage car rallies. The proposal will remove a large area of open space and have detrimental effect on the landscape.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP329	988063		Amazing airport ! Local and a home from home For many ! Not only is it an active GA Airfield but it also keep for us locals a sense of pride being a disused war time RAF base ! Not only does it serve as an alternate safety back up for flights into Doncaster and surrounding airfields ! Gamston offers so much more then just a job or a hobby it's a community of its own and should be kept exactly the way it is !! There is simply no need for the housing ! It's taking open green land away and replacing it with a hardcore housing estate !! And to consider doing so among the airport is just ludicrous !! Taking hundreds of people's hard earnt time and effort away to replace with a housing estate ! Simply baffling ! This is just a small time promise to give jobs and transport etc ! We don't need that in this area ! We have the transport we need also the jobs and more than that AN AIRPORT !!!	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP330	988064		No support for Gamston. It will replace an airport that generates employment and education. Support for housing if it didn't impact on Gamston Airfield.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP331	988083		This survey is deliberately worded to skew results and will not be representative of public feeling. The use of Gamston airfield is vital to me and my business in the area. Fly into Gamston Airfield once a month for business meetings with my fellow directors. Employ around 100 people in the area. Do not have time to spend driving or using commercial flights to any airport in the region. It is VITAL that you use other land for housing and keep this vital strategic amenity for local businesses.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP332	988087		The All-Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation have secured agreement with the Housing Minister and Director of Planning that changes are required to ensure investment and growth in airfields. Retford Airport should be protected from development that would restrict its operation so that the Council is in compliance with the coming changes to the planning law.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP336	988172		No support for Gamston. As a regular user of Gamston airport it would impact on myself and it would be a loss of some valuable skilled workers on site in the different businesses	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP339	988184		Support the proposal for the village near Bevercotes not the plans for the village on the existing airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP342	988214		No support for Gamston. The plan includes destroying an existing transport link, i.e. Gamston / Retford Airport. This is a well used facility providing skilled employment, and training future pilots, of which there is a shortage at the moment. Jobs will be lost if the airport was closed. As a private pilot, I often visit Gamston Airport, bringing business both to the airport and cafe facilities. It can be developed as a regional airport having excellent runway and navigation facilities. It is also well placed for access being near the A1 road	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP346	988247		No support for the new villages. Definitely NO and the agricultural land around is paramount to the economy and the environment and the airport already delivers an employment hub and businesses there are thriving - and as known with large housing development more concrete surface more flooding its not rocket science. leave the airport free to carry on working - the businesses there are already thriving, there must be pockets of totally unused/ derelict land already to be used and enhance the environment.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP348	988323		No support for Gamston. Do not close Gamston Airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP349	988325		No support. Retford airport is a vital local resource that shouldn't be closed for some new houses.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP350	988344		No support. You are destroying a well used local airfield.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP351	988346		No support. The introduction of a new garden village at Gamston airport is not a suitable 'brownfield' site. It is an active airfield supporting General Aviation users and local business. Whilst it may be convenient to shut an airport down and free up a large space there are other Brownfields sites that are not in very active use. It is not just the loss of local employment that would result but a location where the local community that enjoys flying as a pastime or simply to visit and watch and learn about aeronautical skills and activities that reside at Gamston airfield. Closing this airfield is just another 'nail in the coffin' for the wider GA community with the expansion of airspace around major airfields and increasing operating costs the closure of Gamston will prevent air users in visiting the area as associated costs at Doncaster airport would be prohibitive. There is a strategic imperative to maintain a network of airports for GA throughout the UK. Gamston is a key aspect of this and attracts a multitude of aircraft movements from throughout Europe enabling business users to bring wealth into the region. The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated elsewhere in the local plan document. I do not believe the housing demand for this volume of new builds is required in the Retford area	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP351	988346		What about the Air Ambulance operations? Gamston is an ideal site	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP352	988350		No support for Gamston. This would be an extension of the Gamston village - construction of new housing would not be in keeping with the village and could possibly heavily disrupt the local wildlife.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP353	988357		No support for Gamston proposal. Gamston airport is a thriving and buzzing place which brings business to the local area. It provides a home for many local flying schools that feed pilots to then later become commercial pilots. It is home to the children's air ambulance which is essential for children in need. If Gamston airport were to be closed we would lose yet another training base for pilots in a time of a pilot shortage. The negatives of closing the airport vastly outweigh the positives.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP354	988363		Gamston (Retford) airport is not on brownfield ground. It is a thriving airport providing jobs and personal security for scores of people. To just walk in and tear up not only a historic (WW2) airfield but several firms livelihood is nothing short of profiteering by those whose only outlook is lining their own pockets. Please stop this plan and find somewhere else for the homes.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP355	988394		No support for Gamston. "under use of a brown field site" is a misunderstanding of services available at Gamston Airport. The infrastructure of the area is out of context for this monstrous development. Over 100 jobs are provided for local people on the airport with another 100 or so at other establishments offering other types of aircraft engineering. Attitude to the jobs is appalling and is abhorrent - a couple of hundred jobs - don't count. Housing development can be built almost anywhere in Bassetlaw, so don't destroy this valuable asset, for once it has gone can never be replaced. Does not provide jobs for the people of Bassetlaw it is just a pipe dream Provide the jobs before building the houses! Should get behind the airport, promote it and see the real benefit it can (or already has done) bring to the area	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston
DBLP356	988409		No support for the Gamston proposal. Gamston Airport should not be closed to make way for housing. Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden villages' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated elsewhere in the local plan document. The closure of Gamston Airport will not have an impact on climate change significant enough to warrant the loss of skilled employment. STEM jobs and training provided by the likes of the businesses based at the airfield are exactly the type of jobs and training that develop the people and technologies that we need to tackle climate change. Therefore, your proposed policy is in fact counterproductive in this area. With regards to the planned closure of Gamston Airport, it does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in paragraph 104f of the most recent iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The planners also do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create. It is vital that Gamston Airport is not closed for the sake of housing development. It is an important part of local history. Of course I understand that nostalgia cannot save everything, but add the sites historical importance to the fact that General and Business aviation contributes between £2 and 3 billion to the UK economy and relies upon a strategic network of airfields, this has recently been recognised in the latest iteration of UK planning policy (but is not referenced in the Bassetlaw Local Plan). Many hundreds of aircraft from around the UK and the rest of Europe regularly visit the airport because it provides vital transport links for businesses in Retford, Nottingham, Lincoln and the Sheffield City Region. In addition military aircraft primarily helicopters, occasionally use the airport facilities and royal helicopter flights frequently refuel at the airport. Retford-Gamston it is able to accommodate traffic that would not realistically be able to gain access to larger facilities, for example, Doncaster-Sheffield Airport. Following the closure of Sheffield City Airport, Retford-Gamston is now one of the only airports of its size in our region, serving the needs of the business aviation and flying training sectors. That the thought of closing the airport even made it into the proposal is an abomination!	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Items 5 & 6, Infrastructure. These MUST develop as the housing develops. There are too many historical examples where the houses are built with no matching infrastructure (No Doctors, No Buses, No Schools, No etc.) until much later. Gamston Airport: because Gamston Airport is present commercial aircraft have to fly at a higher level on their approach to DSA, so as not to cause issue by or with Gamston Airport on their landing approach. Consequently, with no Gamston Airport restrictions will the flightpath to DSA be lowered thereby causing an increased noise / pollution level to the villages to the north of Bassetlaw that are on the existing flightpath. This needs to be investigated / taken into account in the detailed plan phase.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Support. But we are not in that place and cannot really comment on the effect. But please also see note attached re. flightpath restrictions and the effect on the northern most villages.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP358	988458		No support for Gamston. Retford Gamston is an active airfield and NOT a brownfield site that satisfies the current planning legislation criteria of being either appropriate or redundant land. Airfields of Gamston's size can never be replaced and the airfield provides a significant and skilled workforce with employment.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP360	988474		Against closing Gamston Retford airport and building a 'garden village' on the current site. Will destroy nationally important aviation infrastructure, risk the loss of approximately 100 highly skilled jobs and force the closure or relocation of businesses providing Science, Technology, Engineering and Pilot Training services. •It does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in paragraph 104f of the most recent iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The planners also do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. •Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create •Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. •Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. •The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated elsewhere in the local plan document. •The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksoop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. Indeed, the plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP359	988461		Am a flight student at Gamston Airport and live 1 hour away. This is the closest airport which offers affordable flight training, as this proposal will completely ruin my chances of becoming my future commercial pilot career, my flying will be ruined. Have to travel as far as London to fly all due to a housing estate that is being built just for profit. The negative effects completely outweigh the positives.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP361	988480		Do not support. I do not agree with the closure of Gamston Airport. This is not a good strategy to destroy one are to create another. General Aviation is continually being squeezed out of a large number of areas across the country. Please rethink this approach.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP362	988481		No support for Gamston. Its not the amount of land you allocate it is the quality /amount of jobs created by closing the airport you will remove approx. 100 highly skilled jobs to be replaced by a far lower skill set. By building on gamston airport you are destroying an unreplaceable asset to the uk. Once lost this marvellous amenity ,business,and increasingly vital airport infrastructure can never be replaced. It is against government policy to replace high grade jobs such as aeroplane mechanics ,flight instructors etc with lower paid gardeners ,caretakers , receptionists such as the jobs offered by the proposed redevelopment. by closing the airport you are removing a vital transport link ,providing landing refuel emergency services etc etc. the airport is a great asset to education. The airport provides a open space with added interest...health provision is provided by the emergency services based there ,and a vital refuel stop for air ambulance, police helicopters and the military.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP363	988482		No support. Keep Gamston Airport active.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP364	988487		Do not support. The airport is externally useful for the local community and aviation community. Loosing it would be to much of a loss not to mention the loss of hundreds of jobs and a unique piece of infrastructure	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP366	988491		No support for Gamston. We, having been using Gamston Airport for the last 20 years, would not want to see this facility replaced by houses. This is a valued site for existing businesses and an excellent airport facility that should be lost	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP367	988492		No support for Gamston. The airport is very important and if this goes through 100 jobs will be gone. I use the airport a lot and find the total idea ridiculous!	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP368	988494		Building on Gamston airport would be terrible. This airport has provided training for many people including myself who is still going through training. The airport is well known throughout Yorkshire for being a very good place to get your PPL. It has become my main hobby and the people and facilities there are the best and it would be heart breaking to see it go for housing. I myself work in construction and do not object to construction work, however destroying a well known airfield is just an awful idea.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP369	988496		No support for Gamston. Sorry day when air field goes	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP370	988499		No support for Gamston. Gamston airport is not a brownfield site. It is a serviceable and much needed facility. Repurposing existing infrastructure in this way is out of line with the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as in the most recent iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework. This is tantamount to purposefully closing a hospital or a school in order that it can become a 'brownfield site' available for development.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more
DBLP371	988500		Don't think the question can be answered with a yes or no. Overall, apart from the size of the "villages" which aren't really village sized, I can see the need for these developments. My worry is mainly for my own village which is Eaton, Retford. It is a very small village with an excellent community. It is largely unspoilt with many old buildings and a lovely church. My worry is that with 2 large housing estates close by that our little village will become a rat run for people driving between Ollerton Road and Great North Road as indeed they do now. The village only has a small length of footpath at the East end of the village and it is already quite unsafe to walk on the road due to the amount and speed of the traffic already passing through, this traffic has become much worse since Ordsall bridge was closed for alterations as people had to use Eaton and seem to have continued to do so unfortunately. The bridge in Eaton is very narrow and has already been badly damaged by a large vehicle and people do not heed the 30mph speed limit thus creating a dangerous situation when trying to cross the bridge, either in a vehicle or on foot, quite often large lorries can be seen crossing the bridge despite the weight restriction and I feel personally that this will become much worse with extra housing and industrial buildings. We also have a real problem with litter thrown from cars passing through to the point that villagers are out litter picking the verges most weekends, this problem would increase greatly with an increase in the number of cars passing through. I would hope that perhaps a village access only could be introduced and perhaps a new road completely avoiding the village made available, London Road and Ollerton Road are also not equipped to take any more traffic, Ollerton Road is full of parked cars with a school and 20mph limit and London Road is always heavy with traffic particularly at school and work times and more of a worry is that when there is any incident on the A1, the traffic backs up from Retford as far as Eaton...more reason for people to use the village as a cut through road. Worry that a very special little village that we chose to come and live in will become dangerous if the roads remain as they are. With 4,000 new homes on the doorstep, we are looking at probably another 8,000 cars in the area and this village certainly can't cope with anymore, on the contrary, we could do with less already.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP372	988501		No support for the 2 new villages. As we live in the "village" of Eaton we fear our lives will be impacted in a very negative way. It's not so much the houses themselves it's all that goes with it, extra vehicles, extra people and extra litter on our grass verges. I do think a great deal of care needs to be taken when planning the road infrastructure around these developments, as we in Eaton have already seen a significant increase in traffic since Ordsall bridge was closed last year. Some form of restricted access to Eaton will be necessary for the safety of residents and the protection of the environment.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP373	988503		Do not support. Wholeheartedly disagree with the plan to build homes on the site of Retford Gamston Airport,	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP375	988527		Do not support any attempt to use Gamston airport for this project . Its a fact that councils seem to be driven to target airfields to build so called garden village developments. Gamston provides many skilled jobs and has fantastic facilities. Fly there and cannot understand the policy of destroying uk aviation so there is nothing left but international airports . This is bad for the general aviation which has taken a hammering with airfields being compulsory purchased by short sighted councils . Build them somewhere else that's not being used .	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP376	988557		Agree to the proposal for development at Bevercoates but disagree with the proposal for Gamston. Gamston airfield provides employment in skilled sectors which will be lost. Also, small airfields are declining rapidly throughout the country which is slowly destroying the aviation training and hobby industry.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP377	988599		Strongly oppose the Gamston Airfield, garden village plan. I do not support homes in place of an active General Aviation airfield. The council must embrace the historic importance of RAF Gamston.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP378	988625		No support. The proposal to erase gamston airport from the map is typical of socialist momentum lobby that see all general aviation pilots as millionaires this is not true i have been landing regularly at gamston since it was reopened nearly 30 years ago it provides a great environment for training pilots , creates specialist employment and will be a useful asset when we will be fighting for trade with a new basis eu the proposal is a class war proposal.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP379	988630		No support. There's a working airfield bringing vital revenue into the area. How do you justify losing jobs while throwing up more soulless houses?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP380	988631		No support. The airfield is regularly used and destroying it will mean many people lose their jobs, hobbies, a place to train for their future career. There are 5 training schools- no other airport in the area can accommodate this amount of training. The next closest to me is rutland and their availability is a 6 month wait.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP383			Oppose policy. This must STOP. Stop destroying UK aviation by closing valuable airfields for the sake of a cheap housing development option. Soon there will be no airfields to land/operate from, ruining the future of a huge aviation business infrastructure and economy not to mention the future supply of airline pilots. Airfields provide a myriad of benefits to local communities not least assisting the maintenance of green fields assisting nature and 'Green and pleasant land'! Insist on the wealthy developers ONLY being granted planning permission on previously used 'Brown Field' sites, not Green Field areas. Know they are only interested in profits and green is a lot cheaper to develop. Not our problem! Less profit and more common sense is essential to maintain the environment we know, need and live so much.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP381	988686		Oppose the closure of Retford (Gamston) airport in order to build houses upon it. There is plenty of other land in the vicinity. It would remove an important transport and communications facility which supports business to the local area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP384	988726		Support for policy, in particular Bevercotes. Concerned about the scale of development proposed for Gamston. We wonder whether the employment to the south of the site should be expanded.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP385	988746		Oppose. Why destroy the livelihood of highly skilled workers (aircraft engineers) etc to low paid jobs. Once these skills have been lost or moved out of the area, they are lost forever. Aircraft owners and associates bring their wealth and business to the area, if lost will lead to the demise of the area. There are more suitable areas for housing developments other than destroying historic, thriving businesses	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP386	988747		Oppose. I support the need for much greater housing development in the area. However, I do not believe that the creation of two garden villages is the best way to create sustainable communities in a rural area. I believe that one new village should be built, preferable the one at Bevercotes which makes use of an essentially brownfield site. I do not think that the Gamston site should also be developed. I believe that additional houses should be existing villages so that they can grow and become long term sustainable communities rather than what they are now, ie dormitory villages	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP387	988748		No support. General and Business aviation provides closely tailored, flexible, door-to-door transportation for individuals, enterprises, and local communities, increasing mobility of people, productivity of businesses and regional cohesion. Why are you seeking to kill this off? See: https://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/air/internal_market/general_aviation_en In 2005 there were about 100,000 airport/aerodrome pairs in Europe served by General and Business aviation traffic (as opposed to about 30,000 linked by scheduled airline connections). Only 5% of them had a scheduled alternative (at least one scheduled flight per working day). The same pattern remains when we look at the city-pairs. In 2005 General and Business aviation in Europe served over 80,000 city pairs. Vast majority of this traffic was between city-pairs that had only very limited scheduled alternative (less than one scheduled flight per working day). UK aerial work companies provide high-value, specialised services, both in the Community and third countries. These range from map charting, off-shore services and construction works, pipeline patrolling and conservation, agricultural flights and environment surveillance to weather research, fire-fighting, TV-Live reporting, traffic surveillance and other. Recreational and sport aviation is one of the big sources of qualified aviation staff for airlines and supporting services. Many of the trainee pilots and engineers, after building the number of their hours in the air or in the hangar, subsequently move to work in the airline industry. Aeroclubs and air sports organisations promote individual's qualities, technical knowledge and aeronautical skills - especially amongst the young citizens of the UK, raising their interest in the highly demanding and motivating air sports and future careers in commercial aviation or aeronautical research and development	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP388	988749		No support. Should be more housing built in that already exist not building new ones on dangerous bits of road like the A1.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP389	988774		No support. The proposal to build on Retford / Gamston airport is lazy planning and unnecessary. Of course I recognise that housing is needed but to build on an airport which is part of the nation's transport infrastructure, a base for STEM jobs and a place where young people are encouraged and inspired to enter such jobs is short-sighted and detrimental. Other sites are available to accommodate houses.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP391	98813		Support 2 villages in principle but not on Gamston. Why is it acceptable to build on an airfield? If it was farmland it wouldn't be. Planning law shouldn't permit this.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP392	98889		No support for 2 new villages. They are towns not villages.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP393	989007		No support. Planning of all new housing and or industrial development should firstly consider suitable 'brown sites' in the area without disturbing the green belt or natural recreation areas. There are areas around Worksop that can be allocated for housing without disturbing the aviation assets at Gamston. Firstly the airport is on the wrong side of the busy A1 highway artery meaning that with a predominantly southwesterly wind the noise levels from the ever increasing traffic will be intolerable for residents. The Bevercotes mine site on the other hand is on the opposite side of the A1 road and will be less affected by noise.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP394	989023		No support. With regard to future use of Retford Gamston Airfield under your Local Plan, I urge that due consideration is given to the latest position of the All Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation's Airfields Working Group (APPG GA AWG) on UK airfields. As of February 2019 it is my understanding that the Group are strongly of the belief that destroying the country's regional general aviation airfields (in order, for example, to facilitate the building of houses) is in the long term likely to do more harm than good to the United Kingdom's strategic infrastructure. A link to their website, and in particular an excerpt of the APPG GA AWG is copied below: http://www.generalaviationappg.uk/airfields/ "...The Airfields Working Group is therefore of the view that a strategically important part of our national transport infrastructure is fighting for its survival. The group, and the APPG more widely, fully supports the Government's stated policy of making the UK the best country in the world for General Aviation. The group will therefore be urging Government to introduce immediate changes to the NPPF, and encourage departments across Whitehall to work together to protect the critical network of General Aviation airfields."	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP396	989197		No support. This will encroach on open spaces that will have negative impact on recreation facilities e.g. walking. Using the current airfield as a potential development is a retrograde step as it will take away crucial jobs and business opportunities. In addition the airfield is a historical site with vivid memories from WW2.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP397	989207		No support. I'm currently undergoing training at one of the many flying school at the Gamston airfield. The lost of this important and local airfield would be a big hit to Bassetlaw and nottinghamshire. I've know people who have traveled as far away as Manchester to do training at Gamston. The airfield is an assets to the area and an important source of local income for many people and is important to the local economy.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP398	989569		The proposed Gamston Garden Village does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in paragraph 104f of the NPPF. The proposal also does not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create jobs. Question the assertion that the airfield site is, predominantly brownfield in nature. My understanding is that Planning Guidance is still that only 'previously developed parts' of an airfield should be regarded as 'brownfield' by default, not its whole curtilage. Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The Retford area urgently needs high value jobs of this kind to balance it's reliance on retail and public sector employment. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated elsewhere in the local plan document. It may also be exacerbated by investment decisions taken by Airbus and their impact on employment in Retford based aero engineering at Northern Rubber. The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. Indeed, the plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure. Housing development needs to be balanced with appropriate economic development. This proposed garden village will boost housing at the same time as reducing employment opportunities. It's location on the A1 corridor will encourage occupancy by car borne commuters contributing little to the Retford area economy.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP398	989658		No support. The roads cannot support the extra traffic. Local schools do not have enough places and plans to build new schools will not happen at the beginning of the development so where would any children go until then? The character of the area would be compromised and the local villages particularly Gamston would be swallowed up. Jobs would be lost at the airfield. Medical facilities would be insufficient. Roads are not suitable for more cars, Lorries ect (eg extensive damage again to Eaton Bridge from traffic)	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP399	989741		Support for 2 villages but not on Gamston Airport. Building new homes is essential but needs to be done in a place that does not threaten the facility of Gamston Airport and the jobs of people who work there.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP400	98956	Nottinghamshire County Council - Minerals and Waste	These sites are within the MSA/MCA for brick clay (Plan Four: Minerals Safeguarding and associated Minerals Infrastructure (Draft Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan July 2018)). The sites are approx 7km north of the active brick clay works and quarry at Kirton which is operated by Forterra. As per National Planning Policy (para. 204), the draft Minerals Local Plan contains a policy (SP8) concerning the safeguarding and consultation areas for minerals and associated infrastructure. Although the plan is not yet adopted, its provisions should be given weight as a material consideration. Policy SP8 requires developments within the minerals safeguarding area to demonstrate it will not needlessly sterilise minerals and where this cannot be demonstrated, and there is a clear need for non-mineral development, prior extraction will be sought where practical. Whilst prior extraction at Bevercotes site is unlikely due to its previous use, there is potential for prior extraction for brick clay at Gamston. Prior extraction would address policy SP8, and National Policy, and prevent sterilisation of the mineral and may benefit in terms of land preparation, if applicable. Considering the size of the development proposed and the close proximity of Kirton Brickworks and the active brick clay quarry, it is strongly recommended that the council discuss the development with the operator Forterra. If an application is submitted for development at this location, the applicant should demonstrate they have discussed the development with the operator and that prior extraction has been considered. The applicant would be required to demonstrate that the feasibility of extracting brick clay prior to development has been considered and demonstrate, if found to be not practical nor viable, why this is the case.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP400	98956	Nottinghamshire County Council - Highways	These sites are required to deliver associated community facilities and services, a range of local employment opportunities and supporting infrastructure. These new village communities we are told will be truly sustainable and not simply large housing estates. At the closest point however these villages are 1,700m apart and they will need a mix of facilities and employment opportunities across both sites to improve their sustainability credentials as a whole. The policy covers the village hub but it would appear that the employment focus and secondary education will be at the Gamston Airfield village site. NCC is concerned that the sustainable transport requirements may not be fully met and that one, other, or both of these communities functions as a dormitory settlement with a large proportion of out migration and commuting by car to neighbouring towns and cities. There is a concern that one village may get built and not the other or the pace at which they are built-out does not align such that we do not get the required mix of facilities to create a sustainable location. In which case it is strongly recommended that Policy 12 ought to state that the two villages will be brought forward in phases but as one entity. Comprehensive master planning will be essential if the new Garden villages are to be exemplars of transport sustainability. 6 infrastructure: transport promotes and recommends cycling and walking facilities between the two villages and to communities further afield. Given the distances between the two villages and the vagaries of the British weather it is anticipated the majority of travel between the new Garden villages will be by car, but hopefully with no need to travel much further afield if the facilities and local employment opportunities are provided very early in the development process.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP401	990029		No support. This airport is a first rate example of a general aviation facility that provides much local and specialist employment and it is a vital part of the UK's aviation infrastructure, a system that is a major contributor to our country's economy. Space does not permit me to fully explain why this is so, but do please recall that last time you flew on a business or holiday trip and do consider that the pilots of that large transport aircraft no doubt began their flying careers a place just like Retford/Gamston Airport. Environmentally, although you no doubt classify the airport as a "brown field" site, it is fact, a wide open green space that supports much wildlife and to obliterate this under hundreds of houses would be a tragedy when there are no doubt sites that are truly "brown field."	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more
DBLP401	990029		No support for Gamston.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP402	990030		Support but doubt deliverability. The reliance, albeit limited, on two new villages is debatable and has to be treated with caution. New villages inevitably prove contentious and, if approved, will require substantial infrastructure and other establishment costs. This can prove a deterrent to delivery - an issue that will likely prove to be intractable for two new settlements so close to one another where they will predate upon the same housing market.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP403	990043		Support. Great idea, seen it in other areas - Witham St Hughes, Lincoln and Costessey, Norwich. Implicit in the planning needs to be amenities, school, park, shops, surgeries etc.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP404	990059		Support. Having lived and worked in the area my whole life I have been worried about where my children would find locally to both live and work, the area in in general seems to have been left behind while investment has gone on in many other places for employment and living. The idea of the villages really is fantastic news for the area with the facilities it will bring, the jobs it will create and actually having something built for the 21st century from scratch instead of more houses being crammed into 19th/20th century infrastructure. The close proximity of the A1 and what will hopefully be improved public transport links in the area will be of huge benefit to the local villages and also in bringing more business into the local town. A good service to the train station would be good for the area also	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more
DBLP405	990062		Do not support. The airfield is a viable business and supports employment directly and indirectly. It is also a unique asset for Bassetlaw and should be supported for the potential benefits it could bring. Elkesley will become a poor relation between the 2 garden villages with all investment being directed to the new estates and the village will become forgotten and isolated. Bevercotes sites needs developing but this will necessitate significant improvements to the A1 (3 lane?), the Twyford Bridge junction, the road serving Bevercotes should become a dual carriageway considering there will be an increase of around 6000 vehicle movements. There will be an increased pressure on Ollerton island and the A614 which regularly struggles, especially when farm traffic uses it. Elkesley already has plans to increase its housing stock by 20% (the figure allocated), these garden villages, whilst not strictly in Elkesley are suitably close to make it feel that the increase has been around 750% Town centres are struggling to survive and people need to be encouraged to use them. Housing on the land off north road for example would be better located to encourage town centre shopping. The A1 is so close to the garden villages that people will be encouraged to drive to places like Newark, Lincoln, and to the north Doncaster & Sheffield - all outside of Bassetlaw and so taking the financial spend to other areas.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP407	990068		No support. The area can only just serve the community now without the extra strain .	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP408	990070		Don't support. It will cause extra traffic ,litter , light pollution And bring extra dangers of speeding traffic in our village Eaton. The airport is a benefit to the local community.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP409	990071		Do not support Gamston.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP410	990076		Do not support. There is far to much housing going off as it is. The infrastructure just can't cope! All the council seems to want is housing & supermarkets.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP411	990079		No support. The road system to the proposed new villages is totally inadequate and it will put pressure on the surrounding rural villages. Particularly the close proximity of the village of Eaton which has a totally inadequate narrow road that I feel will become a thoroughfare. The village does not have the capacity to provide a safe traffic calming system over its narrow bridge that already has been the scene of multiple accidents. Also the village of Bothamsall has a similar narrow village road which will be similarly used. I think that an even distribution of housing throughout Bassetlaw would be more effective. Thereby not causing concentrated pressures on all infrastructures such as roads, schools, as well as the necessary services. If Retford cannot sustain a sixth form centre why does it need to add another comprehensive school. Adding more local debt. In addition I think the local area will be losing the advantages that a local airfield brings both for employment and recreation aspect. It has been said that airfields are only able to be earmarked for development accidentally. What a pity the so called experts can't do their jobs properly.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP413	990083		No support for the 2 villages. You haven't followed NPPF section 104f.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP415	990150		Do not support. We do not support the proposal for two new villages if the housing provision is to be set at 6630 dwellings. New settlements can be notoriously slow to take off and deliver housing and generally necessitate substantial advance infrastructure provision before homes can be delivered. The allocation of some 1000 dwellings through to 2035 equates to 15% of the overall housing provision yet over 25% of the residual housing requirement once current commitments and made Neighbourhood Plan allocations are deducted. In the probable scenario of delay with one or more of the new villages coming forward there become increased pressure on the housing market through supply shortages. With the housing provision set at 6630 dwellings, there are sufficient site opportunities around the main urban centres and particularly Retford to accommodate additional development in sustainable locations where infrastructure cost are lower and sites are more likely to be able to viably deliver affordable housing than the new settlement options. Moreover, by selective enlargement of existing rural villages above the 20% growth cap there is potential scope to provide or expand existing community and education facilities that will serve the village and its immediate hinterland. If the Council were to promote a higher housing growth figure such as the 417 dwellings per annum required to support an economic growth target as indicated in paragraph 6.10 of the draft plan then the additional 450 dwellings above the current proposed provision could be allocated for delivery within the new settlements within the plan period to 2035. This would be a more realistic and achievable target for a scheme, that in the respondents opinion, is only deliverable in a stronger economic climate.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP416	990240		No support. This Draft Plan has not fully considered the effects of the extra traffic that would be created by Housing Development on these sites in such close proximity to each other. The proposed so called benefits are not all under the control of Bassetlaw District Council and would, in all likelihood, not come to fruition. The suggestion that Retford and Worksop can provide the facilities for the proposed new residents is not sustainable as travel into either of these two Towns, and other local areas, is already oversubscribed on the existing road network. Improvements to these roads are not in the remit of Bassetlaw Council. If development is staged over a number of years the CIL charges will not be in sufficient volume to pay for infrastructure changes. Additionally it is clearly stated that these CIL Payments will not be 'ring fenced' for this area but will more than likely be spent elsewhere. Hardly a fair treatment for the area that will suffer the most from these developments. Better use of the development land would be for Commercial/Industrial use as the vehicle movements would be less and the Commercial Traffic can be directed to use the A1 Routes to and from the sites. Gamston Airfield is not a Brownfield Site. The definition of Brownfield land is any previously developed land that is not currently in use, whether contaminated or not. It is also used to describe land previously used for industrial or commercial purposes with known or suspected pollution including soil contamination due to hazardous waste. The Gamston Airfield currently supports some 10 Companies with high-value employment of around 100 persons. It provides useful facilities for Commercial Flight/Maintenance, Pleasure, Training, and, very importantly, as support for The Children's Air Ambulance. The Plan states that it is the intention to improve the employment opportunities and assist current employment to be expanded. Here, at one fell stroke, some 10 Employers would be forced to seek alternative sites (these needing, by the very nature of their businesses, to be based on Airfields) and the effect on the 100 or so Employees. All of these housing developments should be directed to be closer to the Town Centres that the Plan wishes to enhance the vitality and viability of, where local public transport or walking can enable these to be accessed, not to by putting more traffic on our already inadequate road system.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP418	990387		Support. These plans, if successful, could well help to enhance the village communities for other villages in these areas.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP419	990400		No support. PLEASE DO NOT DESTROY GAMSTON RETFORD AIRPORT. IT IS A HISTORIC SITE WITH MANY ASPIRING PILOTS USING GAMSTON AS THEIR BASE.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP420	990465		Don't support. I completely understand and agree with the current more housing being built to support the demand in the local area. What I do not agree with, is the proposal to build upon Retford, Gamston Airport. General aviation is a huge sector in the UK that is under-funded, under-appreciated and poorly represented across the country. It has such a large influence on not just free movement in the UK, but the entire airline industry. It's becoming harder and harder to find pilots these days, and with the demand for more and more flights (let alone cheaper flights), the grassroots process to allow people to train in their relatively 'local' area is getting harder and harder. I come from a low wealth family and have had very little support in terms of funding to achieve my lifelong dream of becoming a pilot. As more and more airports shut down, prices and distances to an airport where I can learn to fly increase. As demand for airline pilots increases, the demand for instructors increases. As the demand for instructors increases, the demand for general aviation airports decreases and the number of instructors decreasing, the price of learning to fly increases. As a result, less people (particularly people from an under-privileged background) can learn to fly - hence the harder it is for people like myself to achieve the job that I dream to do, not because of my competence or skill, but because airports like Retford, Gamston Airport are being forced to close as they are poorly represented and under-recognised for the impact they have the UK economy and local areas.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP421	990489		Don't support. I do not understand why at this time of increase environmental awareness Bassetlaw would chose to build homes in an area where people will have to use their car to access anything. I do NOT believe that the developers will build the necessary services especially as the sites are due to be developed over such a long period. They will as usual site financial viability as a get out clause.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP422	990506		Don't support. Strongly opposed to a busy, viable, important General Aviation airfield such as Gamston being built over. The all-party Parliamentary group on general aviation understand that this is a retrograde strategy.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP423	990541		Don't support Gamston	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP424	990549		Don't support. The conversion of an airfield into a village is an unnecessary loss of a potential asset to the area. Light aircraft, police and air ambulances and private charters have few options for access to large international airports. Instead of converting the airfield to a village why not invest with the airport owners in developing it as an asset bringing people and money to the area and preserving the jobs which are associated with it.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP425	990570		Don't support. Just because Gordon Brown made airfields Brownfield sites doesn't mean councils can't have a bit more vision! Rather than closing existing important infrastructure to the detriment to the local employment which offers an opportunity in future proofing of an area's ability to adapt to business needs. Look a bit further afield and perhaps allow localised development adjacent to existing villages.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP426	990571		Don' support. I think it's crazy taking away another airfield. Gamston airfield is a great place to visit and supports various business and a superb cafe/ restaurant. If we keep taking away all of these small airfields where are aircraft going to land? We are not far off getting flying cars. Where are you proposing they take off from? Down the M1??	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP427	990577		Don't support. We don't need to spread out, we need to build upwards. Stop building on green open spaces and places like Gamston Airport and build in preexisting urban spaces.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP428	990594		Don't support. Loss of vital aviation site that is beneficial to the local economy. There needs to be more housing I agree however not on the site proposed.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP429	990613		Don't support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP430	990614		Support	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP431	990633		Don't support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP434	990659		Don't support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP435	990666		Don't support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP436	990682		Don't support. It is sad that short term gain is being planned in a myopic fashion. The inclusion of Gamston Airfield in this proposal is counter intuitive with overall government aims of encouraging the UK to be the hub of pilot training. Gamston is one such airfields which is the lifeblood of not only small business but also the source of burgeoning professional pilots where there is a widely predicted shortage over the coming years. It is also contrary to the preservation of wildlife, which is sadly rapidly diminishing as it is well known that Local airfields, such as this, provide a necessary sanctuary for a huge variety of plants, insects and animals .	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP437	990704		Don't support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP438	990717		Don't support. Destroying a working airfield, which is part of the UK network of small airfields and important to businesses of all sizes, will not create employment. This airfield already employs around 100 highly skilled people. A new village on this site will increase traffic, noise and pollution in the area far out weighing its present use. At a time when we are all subject to the negative effects of the 'de-greening' of our countryside, losing a large area of open space cannot be justified. Vast built up areas are a major loss to our flora and fauna and ultimately, to us.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP439	990719		Don't support. If this ensures no houses will go up in the villages then maybe i would support this only to protect the rural villages. BUT as we know the new villages will destroy land and wildlife and clearly will increase traffic through the villages - so its a no win situation! Shouldnt investment be made in the highest wards of deprivation and bring jobs into those areas especially since they have the infrastruture already there.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP440	990764		Don't support	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP441	990783		Support. We wish to support the proposal for two new settlements. The advantages of new settlements are that road and sewerage infrastructure, surface drainage, and schools can be organised at an early stage. We do not support further large-scale expansion of the existing villages and towns because we do not believe that existing road and sewerage infrastructure can cope and constructing new infrastructure will be very difficult and disruptive. Indeed the proposed two new settlements are both near to primary roads and have plentiful sites for new sewerage works and schools. Most of the existing villages and towns lack large-scale employment possibilities and the major future sources of employment for people living in this area are likely to be in the nearby cities. Therefore building new houses near to primary roads is essential for commuting. The residents of these new settlements will have excellent access to nearby countryside such as Clumber Park and Rufford. Residents of the new settlements will also have easy access to out-of-town and edge-of-town facilities in the existing towns. The existing towns will perhaps see some loss of facilities in their centres, but that loss is inevitable and has indeed already been underway for many years.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP442	990799		Don't support. These are not villages but small towns imposed in a rural agricultural area, at present highly productive and environmentally friendly landscape. Pollution will be increased.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP443	990800		Do not support	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP444	990802		Do not support. My natural reaction to the Garden Villages proposal which is tantamount to being a new Town development as it concentrates most of Bassetlaw's housing target in two places and does not need a lot of infill in the existing Retford villages. It therefore achieves the current Government's requirements. However by looking at a 30+ year projection there seems to be no consideration that Government policies will change over the years and that it may be that there are two part-finished villages with insufficient facilities because there have been local, national and even international political changes. It is a garden village idea presentationally but realistically it is urbanisation of a rural and attractive area. The 'Garden' Village concept seems inappropriate when houses will be 'dumped/deposited' onto an area and as most new houses nowadays seem to be placed on site locations with postage stamp gardens! If this plan is more or less a 'fait accompli' (and from feedback at local consultation sessions it appears to be the case from what BDC staff and consultants have said) I would therefore propose that one Garden Village is built – preferably on the available site of Bevercotes and that if appropriate this model is then used for another site at a later stage. The report produced last year into assessing the suitability of three sites (Carlton, Bevercotes & Gamston) the Carlton site is more conducive to such development as it is close to an urban area such as Worksop and not far from a major city such as Sheffield. It is also much closer to existing services such as leading regional and local hospital facilities and a greater concentration of existing and potential industries and employment opportunities. The two villages will be one community but am sure that each village would form its own identity and would not wish to be a single community with the A1 separating them. Take on board that these areas are mostly Brownfield sites and are ripe for development. However I feel that their proximity to each other is not a valid consideration because each one will have its own identity and will be separated by the A1 intersection even if road upgrading takes place. It appears that as yet there is a lack of information relating to the service providers in these villages and how they will tie in with current pressurised services, facilities and lack of qualified staffing. Recruitment in many of these public and private services and enterprises in this area is already very difficult. 1000 houses satisfies Government targets more easily than spreading across the edges of Retford and in existing villages but does not take into account the economic development and nature of potential employment. Increasing the population does not necessarily guarantee any economic growth or even the population investing in their locality. These villages could become dormitory settlements where employees and employers commute to the cities as this already seems to happen increasingly in the Retford area. Initially there could be a lack of facilities and qualified staff for such a large expected population. According to BDC staff at the consultation it is not proposed to supply new school places until several years into the house building and perhaps not until the end of the first 15 year phase. New Schools are mentioned but wonder if house builders will be prepared to build them in the early stages of the new houses' development.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP444	990802		Reconsiders the 3 areas which were previously considered for garden villages. Carlton still needs consideration because of its proximity to economic and social opportunities in Worksop and Sheffield. Reassess the need for new residential development on the Bevercotes and Gamston sites by looking at building around Retford and existing large villages where the concentration of population would be close to retail and leisure facilities. These facilities may need some enhancement but not new builds. Investigate the move of current industrial and employment opportunities onto the Bevercotes (already been designated as industrial land) and Gamston sites from such areas in and around Retford and use the industrial sites for new housing as they would be close to the A1 network, mitigate environmental issues and the usage of local roads. However as planned when the Bevercotes site was designated as a Warehouse site some years ago the A1 access slip roads and the bridge over the A1 do need investment and attention. Further liaison with Notts County Council and regional authorities to ascertain the best way forward. Why were NCC representatives from highways, education, fire and other NCC services not present at the Consultative sessions?? PLEASE LOOK AT PROVIDING QUALITY RATHER THAN QUANTITY and not so much focus on ticking Government boxes!	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP445	990806		Do not support	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP446	990814		Do not support. Without more detailed proposals it is very difficult to give an opinion. The road infrastructure in this area is very poor and will need a massive upgrade to accommodate this number of houses. Bevercotes Colliery site, however is an obvious choice for new development.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP447	990818		Do not support	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP448	990826		Do not support. I do not support the proposal to have 2 new villages at Bevercotes & Gamston Airfield. The roads in the area, except for the A1, are rural roads & struggle to cope with the current volume of traffic. Building two new villages so close would create additional transport & the current road layouts would not be able to cope.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP449	990829		Do not support. Villages not needed. Keep Gamston as an airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP450	990836		Do not support. I fully support the use of derelict land, however Gamston airport is a going concern that offers employment in STEM sectors. There are only so many sandwich makers required in Worksop... a corner shop in the new village will not replace the lost employment opportunities.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP451	990837		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP452	990841		Do not support. Definitely not at Gamston. If this proposal is to satisfy some central government directive then I suggest you look only at the colliery site. Gamston airport is too valuable in terms of everything it offers. To lose it would be disastrous	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP453	990842		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP454	990843		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP455	990845		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP456	990846		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP457	990847		Do not support. Specifically the Gamston Aerodrome site; there was no information around improvements to the B6387 or the A1 slip roads, would serve both the proposed village sites. The B6387 is arguably already not fit for purpose with common RTAs and the A1 bridge being down to a single lane long term. The existing industrial estate being cited as providing employment for the new village is not viable as there are few businesses left on there currently and any businesses moving on to the estate would have to make massive investment as most of the site is out dated and not fit for purpose. There seems to be no mention of the viable businesses that do exist on the airfield, so this proposed site will in fact remove business and employment from the area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP458	990848		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP459	990849		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP460	990850		Support	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP461	990852		Do not support. Gamston Airport should remain. The plan ignores the benefits of having a local airport with the facilities of Gamston. The airport is an easy target and other land should be found. I strongly object to the plan to close Gamston airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP462	990854		Do not support. If going to do it leave the airport out of it.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP463	990855		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP464	990856		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP465	990859		Do not support. Need Gamston airport for the local community. Partner has a private pilots licence he learnt to fly at Gamston. Keep our plane at Gamston. Know lots of people who businesses at Gamston and rely on it for their livelihood. Do not build houses on this valuable facility	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP466	990862		Do not support. The proposal has not considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs. Hundreds of jobs will be lost at Gamston, people will have to move away, it will ruin homes.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP467	990865		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP468	990869		Do not support. I object to the destruction of Gamston airport. It is a valuable part of the National transport infrastructure and source of quality engineering and scientific jobs.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP469	990882		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP470	990884		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP471	990885		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP472	990886		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP473	990889		Do not support. One of the choices of land is Retford Gamston Airport. This is not only my location of employment but also location of history to myself and many others. I gained my licence, flew my grandpa who is no longer with us and is also the location of multiple other business and aircraft owners. The site is a place of public interest and wildlife.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP474	990891		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP475	990893		Do not support. Not if they threaten Gamston airfield's status, there is plenty of other land that could be used instead.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP476	990895		Do not support. The construction of two new villages on Gamston Airfield and the former Bevercotes Colliery appears from this document as if it has been added at a late stage. In relation to Rural Bassetlaw, these proposed new villages are not, as stated: 'proportionate growth through a careful mix of planned and managed organic development'. They and risk severely damaging the local environment while blighting nearby rural communities. Both proposals to build new towns on Gamston Airfield and the open space of the former Bevercotes Colliery are inappropriate for the locations. The Draft Plan itself recognises this in various sections of the report that these proposals would jeopardise existing business, destroy open landscapes, threaten recently restored open habitat and, create excessive local traffic. The Draft Plan is therefore contradictory and confused: e.g. Section 12.15; 'The former Bevercotes Colliery is enclosed within dense woodland, while Gamston Airfield is nestled in the gentle undulations of lush, green farmland.' Section 12.17 How can a new housing development on a. a currently open, green airfield, and b. in a wooded site, be considered 'inherently rural in nature'? With these factors in mind, it is considered that neither site is suited to housing development without significant detrimental impacts to the surrounding environment. Gamston Airfield Less experienced local planners may not be aware that in 2003 an 'administrative oversight' led to the deletion of a footnote in PPG3, noting that airfields and hospital grounds should not be considered as appropriate brownfield sites. Current definitions of previously developed land make no reference to airfields or flying sites. As a result, developers and local planning authorities are increasingly and inappropriately treating airfields as brownfield sites for land redevelopment, leading both to the loss of an important part of national transport infrastructure and the destruction of significant areas of natural habitat within airfield boundaries. Gamston Airfield is a busy, popular general aviation airfield, with a vital history. It is in open countryside, and supports thriving commercial businesses. In the Draft Plan, Gamston Airfield is repeatedly stated to be 'brownfield land', despite considerable confusion and continued debate on the classification of open areas within active airfields. It is recommended that the proposal to build a new town on Gamston is withdrawn and Bassetlaw Council work more closely with the All-Party Parliamentary Group on General Aviation (APPG-GA) to discuss new planning guidelines aimed at further protecting airfields. There are likely to be significant commercial opportunities to further develop the site as a vital asset, without adversely impacting the local environment. Seek advice from Stratford-upon-Avon District Council, who are committed to keeping the thriving, yet similarly threatened Wellesbourne Airfield open as an strategic asset to the local and national economy.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP476	990895		Do not support. Bevercotes Section 8. Figure (table?) 7. Bevercotes is listed as a settlement where growth is not supported. The Draft Plan is contradictory. Bevercotes is in fact a rural, isolated area, and is therefore best suited to reversion or re-wilding. Bevercotes is better suited to habitat gain and biodiversity offsetting funded through S106 agreements from other development around the Bassetlaw area. Section 13.10 – 13.13 Flood Risk Bevercotes Colliery could be used as a Flood Detention area, reducing, (instead of potentially increasing) flood risk to downstream areas while providing synergistic habitat and environmental gains. Potentially this could be funded from a Developer Contribution or Section 106 agreement from any future downstream developments. In the event that Gamston Airfield continues to operate, and Bevercotes is built on, what measures will be taken to ensure that any proposed development at Bevercotes does not impact lawful flying? In particular, any development should recognise recent planning policy which ensures that it will be up to developers building new properties nearby to identify and tackle noise problems. Under the new guidance, the onus will fall on the developers who build the houses to soundproof the properties. Gamston is an active airfield with a flying approach over the proposed Bevercotes housing development. What measures will be put in place to ensure there is no impact to lawful aircraft movements?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP477	990901		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP478	990904		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP479	990910		Do not support. The location of the proposed Garden Village on the site of the current Gamston Airport is suggested to be good use of a brown field site. I find the suggestion that the site is currently underused and the land use is ineffective wholly false. The airport supports on average 16 flights per day, is home to a flying school and employs many highly skilled local residents. In addition to this the classification as a brown field site in its entirety is a little misleading as the airport only utilises approximately 25% of the proposed site with the rest being laid to productive farm land producing arable crops. Building in two phases a total of 2500 homes would lead to the loss of this facility, the highly skilled employment opportunities and productive farmland.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP480	990912		Do not support. It does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in paragraph 104f of the most recent iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The planners also do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated in the local plan. The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. Indeed, the plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP481	990913		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP482	990914		Do not support. Very short sighted to destroy a thriving airfield (Gamston) that supports the local economy by providing valuable transport links and numerous jobs.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP483	990915		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP484	990916		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP485	990917		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP486	990918		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP487	990919		Do not support. Keep your hands of your only airport. I often visit the airport and wish to carry on thank you.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP488	990921		Do not support. Creating a new village entirely is in a sense hypocrisy because I believe the location of this to be ideal for commuters, and that would be the plan for unaffordable housing for the many. In such you would then be creating a dwelling spot for those who can afford to pay, and thus not create a village, no, recreational or social involvement, as many villages have with sports teams, pubs etc	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP489	990922		Do not support. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. The local plan will destroy nationally important aviation infrastructure leading to the loss of advanced technology and engineering businesses and pilot training. It will also leave the Children's Air Ambulance without a base in the Retford area and will result in the loss of approximately 100 highly skilled jobs.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP490	990926		Do not support. No it is too much and will destroy our beautiful area.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP491	990928		Do not support. Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated elsewhere in the local plan document.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP492	990930		It does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in NPPF paragraph 104f. The planners also do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create. Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated elsewhere in the local plan document. The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. Indeed, the plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP493	990933		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP494	990934		Do not support. Closing Retford gamston airport will be a huge loss to the aviation community, both general aviation but the training of next generation pilots from the region, losing the 100 so jobs from the airport will negatively impact the industry greatly as airports such as east mids and Doncaster push more and more commercial traffic	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP495	990936		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP496	990937		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP497	990938		Do not support. No, why destroy a highly used air field for housing? Why not build at shire oaks where there is loads of land and you're not bothering as many residents	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP498	990940		Do not support. Using an ex-coliery site for the proposal does make sense, however using a thriving local airport containing numerous successful businesses as a site to build a new village makes very little sense to me. Airports in their nature are spacious and whilst on paper it is down as being brownfield, you only have to visit Gamston Airport to realise how 'Green' this brownfield site is. The draft proposal says it itself. "nested in lush farmland". There are far more deserving brownfield sites in the area that are of no use other than redevelopment.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP499	990942		Do not support. Not if they involve the destruction of the Airport. This is one of the best small airports in the country, I visit regularly both by air and as a stopping point on a journey from London. It has several thriving businesses that need the facilities provided. You will have thousands of houses, you only have one airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP500	990943		Do not support. It does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in paragraph 104f of the most recent iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The planners also do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. - Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support opportunities to retain and create - Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. - The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. Other airports across the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated elsewhere in the local plan document. The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Workshop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. Indeed, the plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure. - the plan totally disregards the governments wish to maintain and grow STEM jobs through aviation. Small plane aviation (GA) contributes £3bn NET to the UK economy, the plan ignores this and treats the bs at Gamston airport as available anywhere, when they are not and are unique to this site. - the plan ignores golf courses in the surrounding area that are environmentally damaging, cater to a small number of people, whose numbers are dwindling, and countryside contribute only £2bn to the UK economy but occupy over 2% of the UK landmass, versus 1.8% occupied by housing, and less than .2% occupied by aviation transport infrastructure, ie airport! Thus golf course would be better suited for this type of housing. To build on Gamston airport would be a travesty and breach several national and local guidelines.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP501	990944		Do not support. There is more than enough urban space suitable for development without using the valuable asset of a local airfield and arable land. In a modern, forward thinking community, the development of an asset like Gamston Airfield into a valuable link to Europe and the rest of the country, to provide links and trade for the local area, would be far better use of the resource.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP502	990946		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP503	M Turner		Do not support. The Draft Local Plan fails to provide evidence for the scale of development or the viability of the development at Retford Gamston Airport, or Bevercotes. It is also not backed up with a viable economic argument that would generate the needed employment in the area. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which as an active airport this is clearly not. Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. From the local consultation meetings, it was stated that other airports, such as Scampton, could replace Gamston. This is a simple fallacy as the closure of other airfields is already causing pressure on the few other local airfields. Netherthorpe is too small, Scampton is unlikely to open to General Aviation, and Doncaster is unsuitable due to its scale and Public Transport role.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP503	M Turner		Lived in Workshop for 13 years, and now live in East Markham. Office is in Sheffield however I travel a lot, including to London. I have an aircraft at Retford Gamston Airport. I have chosen to live here, and hope to retire here, because of the quality of life I can achieve and proximity to rail, road and airport(s). If the airport closes and I cannot find another suitable local airport (and there isn't one, including Netherthorpe) then I will move away from Bassetlaw.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP504	990949		Do not support. There are plenty of space in village in and around Retford and Workshop just take a look people need shops and pubs not live middle of no where.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP505	C Taylor		Do not support. There is not the infra structure in place to support the two proposed villages if they were located at the Bevercotes site and Gamston airfield.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP506	990952		Do not support. By all means utilise Bevercotes land but to take them into the beautiful areas of Eaton and Gamston will be an eyesore.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP507	990954		Support. Reading it, it sounds an excellent idea for the local community and future prosperity.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP508	990955		Do not support. Absolutely not. Building new housing estates does not build a community! The idea in theory is lovely, but as soon as you put it in to practice, you end up with the same anonymous boxed developments as you see up and down the country.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP509	990959		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP510	990961		Do not support. I strongly object to remove a thriving airport and its associated businesses to be replaced for housing.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP511	990962		Do not support. There are sites in Worksoop which could easily accomodate this requirement. Gamston Airport is a valuable asset to the area and most certainly should not be considered for housing.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP512	990964		Do not support. Gamston Airport should not be turned into a garden village or any other kind of housing development. New housing developments should also not be located under the established air traffic patterns of aircraft arriving/departing Gamston Airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP513	990965		Support. If there is the need for these houses, then I can't think of 2 sites that could be any better for them, but I can can think of plenty that would be worse. Both sites would have minimal impact on existing houses if the project is carried out correctly. I have heard more positive comments from other locals than negative with many looking forward to the extra opportunities in housing, employment and facilities that should come. The negativity that I have heard amounts to little more than people who feel they shouldn't have others living and travelling near their homes while happily driving their kids across the village passed everyone else's houses just to get to the school that is in walking distance - hypocrites. Seeing the airfield go will be a shame, but the reality is, few young people are taking up private flying and no doubt it will soon become unviable. I'm sure the housing building and employment area will have a huge net increase on the number of jobs.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP514	990980		Do not support. MOST DEFINITELY NOT. You will create two "ghettos" of people with few job opportunities and inadequate local transport links, whilst destroying an airport which is a vital part of the regional transport infrastructure. LEARN FROM GAINSBOROUGH - where a large estate was built out of town to house an overspill of people from elsewhere whilst the two main employers in the town had gone out of business - the resulting huge social problems of that area will be repeated in your two villages and Retford will be inundated with unemployed people.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP514	990980		The Bassetlaw Draft Plan seeks to establish two "Garden Villages" without providing indication of where there might be employment for their thousands of inhabitants who are of working age. Creation of one of these villages incurs the destruction of an active airfield which provides transport links for local businesses and many other activities, all of which provide employment for up to 100 skilled personnel. General and Business aviation contributes between £2 and 3 billion to the UK economy and relies upon a strategic network of airfields, this has recently been recognised in the latest iteration of UK planning policy (but is not referenced in the Bassetlaw Local Plan). Many hundreds of aircraft from around the UK and the rest of Europe regularly visit the airport because it provides vital transport links for businesses in Retford, Nottingham, Lincoln and the Sheffield City Region. In addition military aircraft primarily helicopters, occasionally use the airport facilities and royal helicopter flights frequently refuel at the airport. The airfield is equipped with a range of modern facilities that are not routinely available at similarly sized airports including pilot controlled lighting and a co-located navigation aids. The runways at Retford-Gamston are also long enough to accommodate light jet aircraft for business, charter operations and medical evacuation flights in addition to private flying and helicopter operations. Retford-Gamston is able to accommodate traffic that would not realistically be able to gain access to larger facilities, for example, Doncaster-Sheffield Airport. Following the closure of Sheffield City Airport, Retford-Gamston is now one of the only airports of its size in our region, serving the needs of the business aviation and flying training sectors. Five thriving flying schools are now based at the site, continuing a long tradition of flying training to this day, each flying school provides training to standards required by the UK Civil Aviation Authority and the European Aviation Safety Agency.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP514	990980		Arguments against the Plan's proposal to destroy Retford Airport are as follows: • It does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in paragraph 104f of the NPPF. The planners also do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. • Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for redevelopment of the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to "support opportunities to retain and create new community and transport infrastructure, facilities and services, and ensure that impacts on them are appropriately mitigated" • Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. Arguments against the Plan's proposal to destroy Retford Airport are as follows: • It does not take into account the requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in paragraph 104f of the NPPF. The planners also do not appear to have considered 'the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. • Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for redevelopment of the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to "support opportunities to retain and create new community and transport infrastructure, facilities and services, and ensure that impacts on them are appropriately mitigated" • Other suitable brownfield land is available for housing development in the local area. Partial-development of the site would also be possible to capitalise on existing aviation and technology sector strengths whilst retaining an active airport that will provide more skilled jobs for local residents. The plan references the airport site as 'brownfield' however planning legislation requires this to be suitable or redundant brownfield land, which the active airport is clearly not. - Other airports cross the region are unable to adequately accommodate the business and aviation activity that would be displaced by the proposed 'garden village' including 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft including business jets, helicopters and light aircraft. The airport also currently provides a home for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter. • The direct loss of highly skilled technical and STEM jobs at the airport site and throughout the region, including flight training, engineering, support services contradicts strategic objectives 4 and 6 (economic development) stated elsewhere in the local plan document. • The draft local plan makes a case for local housing need in Worksoop (9.7) but does not provide the same level of evidence for Retford. Indeed, the plan states that Retford has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years since 2011, this being without the need to destroy existing infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP514	990980		The following list has been compiled from publically available data to describe some of the service, engineering, pilot training and technology sector businesses based at Retford airport, including: • A provider of full service airborne sensing solutions that operates a fleet of 10 'special mission' equipped aircraft fulfilling UK government and European agency contracts for airborne intelligence, surveillance & reconnaissance and aerial survey work. • The European headquarters of a multinational company who have a reputation as world leaders in providing flight inspection, navigation, communication and calibration services for air transportation. They work with navigational aids, airfield lighting and communications equipment for civilian and military use and provide real time passenger information for public transport operators. • Aircraft continuing airworthiness management, sales & contract maintenance. • Ground handling services for visiting business aircraft, passengers and pilots. • The UK & Eire distributor for aircraft manufactured by Diamond Aircraft Industries of Austria. • Five separate businesses are engaged in pilot training to European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) and Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) standards, aircraft rental and trial flying lessons for local people. • An excellent café and restaurant often visited as much by local residents as aircraft operators. • A number of other local businesses, including providers of engineering and aviation services rely on the airport and visiting aircraft as a source of work. Nottinghamshire Police use the site (between 12 and 15 times per annum) to deliver advanced driver training in tactical pursuit and containment. • Aircraft owners and the Retford-Gamston based flying schools demonstrate a socially responsible approach to engaging with the wider community to improve knowledge of STEM subjects. For example, a recent children's charity day involving educational activities and a flying experience for local children.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP515	991045		Do not support. I object to the housing estate at Retford Airport. The old pit site nearby is a more suitable place to build a housing estate because it is a true brownfield site (your plans at the airport rely on a technicality of planning law and local people can see that).	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP516	991153		Do not support. It is vitally important that Bassetlaw District Council ensures that Gamston Airfield is retained as a general and business aviation airfield in its plans. This is an airfield with an important history being involved in the second world war. It is now an important airfield in the area serving both general aviation pilots as well as business flights. There are also a number of businesses on the airfield that are providing local employment.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP517	991157		Do not support. The area between Bevercotes and Gamston is not so many miles apart There would be a huge impact on that area in all aspects.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP518	991172		Do not support. I believe all the options have not been explored properly. BDC says it doesn't want the drawbacks of coalescence (tagging a village onto the end of an existing village) which in essence this plan does. I believe smaller developments spread more evenly throughout the area would provide a better option, without destroying the existing villages. This plan has also not shown any predictions on air quality in the district. Spreading the developments would hopefully spread the emissions more evenly as well.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP519	991173		Do not support. Spoiling ru rally outlook plus expected traffic problems.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP520	991174		Do not support. I believe all the options have not been explored properly. BDC says it doesn't want the drawbacks of coalescence (tagging a village onto the end of an existing village) which in essence this plan does. I believe smaller developments spread more evenly throughout the area would provide a better option, without destroying the existing villages. This plan has also not shown any predictions on air quality in the district. Spreading the developments would hopefully spread the emissions more evenly as well.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP521	991176		Do not support. Absolutely not. The surrounding road network would not be able to accommodate the extra traffic leading to increased pollution. Traffic is already bad enough in the surrounding villages. If Gamston airport closes there will be a loss of employment and air traffic from Robin Hood airport will increase/fly lower over the area. There would be a substantial loss of wildlife habitat. Who is going to want to live in these villages? Older people won't and younger people prefer to live in towns/cities.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP522	991178		Do not support. I would hardly call the proposals villages they are certainly urban extensions . I can see up to a point the Bevercotes pit site as it is more compact and you could maybe see a local community , Gamston Airfield however is far too big and seems to tag on to an already existing village . There are already areas identified in Retford and the surrounding areas so why not have smaller quantities of housing spread over a larger area , where it will have less of an impact . Also the sites at Shireoakes and Harworth where there are good road and rail links already in place and are within easy reach of Sheffield ,Doncaster and Rotherham The council discusses using existing Brownfield sites ? while this maybe true of Bevercotes , Gamston Airfield is predominately a green field site comprising of mainly good quality Agricultural land growing a wide range of crops Also what will happen to the jobs and business already established here ?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP523	991181		Do not support. My objections solely relate to the proposed closing of Gamston Airport. It would be a travesty to allow the airfield to be given over to building development and to permanently lose such a great local asset. Gamston Airport is an award winning facility and one of the best General Aviation Airports in the UK. Far from considering using the airfield for building land, Bassetlaw DC should be defending and supporting Gamston Airports future.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP524	991184		Do not support. Bassetlaw Council has evidenced no positive action, as part of this draft plan, as to how it intends to attract business investment into the area in order to create the jobs necessary to sustain and support such major housing developments. Without businesses and the jobs they create then all that these housing developments will become are commuter enclaves to add to the 17,000 people you already acknowledge are travelling out of Bassetlaw on a daily basis for work.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP524	991184		Reconsider all of the impacts upon businesses and resultant loss of jobs along with all the benefits to local economy, the loss of a strategic resource to the Bassetlaw area that should be used to help attract business investment to the area. And instead of closing Retford Gamston Airport concentrate its efforts on redeveloping the otherwise derelict former Bevercotes Colliery site.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP525	991186		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP526	991188		Do not support the closure of Gamston Airport. This plan significantly under estimates the scope and type of employment at Gamston Airport. The plan refers to Gamston airport as a brownfield site. Such sites are redundant, former industrial areas, which is definitely not the case with Gamston Airport.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP527	991190		Support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP528	991208		Do not support. I think just one should be created at Bircotes but that Gamston should be left as it is with a mixture of agricultural land (which is of sufficient size to still be commercially farmed and the airport which has been a successful business and created jobs in the area. I think instead there should be more building in the villages particularly East Markham which has a lot of unusable fields going to waste as they cannot be farmed commercially due to their small size.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP529	991209		Support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP530	991219		Do not support. The scale of the two new villages is far too big for the area. You will take away the 'village' and replace it with a town. Retford is a market town with the villages surrounding it and it should remain that way. The sheer amount of traffic these new villages would create would be colossal for the area. The road that is Muttonshire Hill is already a very busy road by commuters in and out of Retford. If you imagine 4000 houses for both sites, potentially all with 2 cars minimum per house, that is 8000 more vehicles each day. The noise would dramatically increase as would the pollution. If there is a need to close the A1 the traffic is diverted through the villages and Retford causing mayhem and gridlock. Even more vehicles in the area would only add to the strain on the roads. If the airport closes jobs will be lost, peoples hobbies will cease and we will also lose seeing the small planes in the area. Which is such a shame as on a summers day our children love seeing the planes come in. There is a wood that borders the runway. On the plan it shows that this will be left alone. But will it? There are lots of wildlife that live in that small wood. We were only just looking at 5 deer in the field at the back of our house yesterday (9/3/19) which then went into the woods. There are also some buzzards and owls that live in there too. They will no longer remain there once building starts. The bridge at the bottom of Muttonshire Hill will not take the amount of traffic. It is a very tight bend and vehicles do not slow down enough. There have been 5 vehicles crash through the bridge since Christmas! When we return home in our car we have to wait on Muttonshire Hill for our gate to open. Vehicles do not slow down enough to stop if there are oncoming vehicles, how they have not hit our cars I do not know but it will only be a matter of time with more traffic on the road. Whilst there aren't any plans for houses to be built directly at the back of our house (that we are aware of) we do not want there to be any. We moved out of the town to be able to look out onto fields and have paid a premium for this. The whole idea of a village is that it is rural and quiet. All of these new houses will take the village feel away. If I wanted to live in a town I would but I don't. I want to live in a quiet village. We have concerns about sewerage and drainage, where will it go? In Gamston we use heating oil. Will these new estates also use the same fuel or will gas be installed? If the airport is sold and knocked down, does that mean we will then be on the flight path for Doncaster airport? Whilst we enjoy the small aircraft flying around we don't want to see massive planes over our house. What about Policing in the area? The local police stations are already stretched and working on low staffing levels as it is. The quiet nature reserves in the area will no longer exist. Where are commuters from these estates going to park their cars if using the trains from Retford? The parking near the train station is a nightmare as it stands. What about the amount social housing? How much of these estates will be dished out for them? Apparently more farmland is going to be sold off in future. These two plans are only the start of it. Where does it end? Where are all these house buyers coming from and where are they going to be working?	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP531	991221		Do not support. as a resident of Gamston, I am concerned at the idea of 2 new villages both next to Gamston no rural area inbetween. The rural infrastructure is not upto this expansion. I believe the Bevercotes site and the Elkesley end of the Gamston site would be better suited to commercial / industrial use due to easy access to the A1. Residential housing would be better placed near existing large scale housing sites, Harworth and Shireoaks would lend to extending, having facilities in place and better access to the road links to the M1 and A1. They are both on the north side of the district close to the Bassetlaw Hospital / Worksop and within easy reach of Sheffield, Rotherham and Doncaster. Building on the Gamston Site would see the loss of skilled jobs over 100 on the aerodrome.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP532	Gareth Evans		<p>The village of Gamston has NO local amenities; there is no shop or health facilities. Our roads are already under-funded and dangerous – 2 cars have been pulled out of the river in the past 6 months alone. Our walk to school includes crossing the main road where vehicles regularly speed past my 8 and 9 year old at 60mph. This is already dangerous and an accident waiting to happen. The quiet village road past Gamston Church will also have increased traffic as it already is a cut through - there is no way to expand this road. A significant number of new homes within a 2.2km radius will only increase the traffic and the likelihood of severe injury or death to local residents. The main road connecting these 2 new villages to each other and the A1 is in desperate need of repair. The bridge has been reduced to single lane traffic with no intention to repair in sight. As I am aware this is a Highways and Nottinghamshire County Council issue. With that in mind how can the plan suggest it is the developer's responsibility to correct and maintain the infrastructure? Please see further notes from personal experiences. We have limited public transport services through our village and these will only decrease with lack of funding rather than increase. This leaves no choice for residents (old and new) but to drive. Our village school (and other local schools) are only a few places off full capacity. To have such a massive increase in families locally will only stretch educational resources further in an area that is working hard to achieve high standards. Our nearest health facilities, shops etc are in Retford, Ordsall, Tuxford – we have moved into the area knowing this and are happy to NOT have these facilities close to home. We enjoy spending time and money supporting local shop owners in Retford Town Centre, we value their contribution to the community in an age where town centres are dying due to out of town retail and housing. The vitality and future prosperity of the town centre is something that needs addressing NOW and not left to diminish in the future. The environmental impact on our village, its residents and visitors will be huge. Aside from a huge increase in traffic, lacking road systems and general expenses for the maintenance of a heavily used road network valuable farmland will be developed into a concrete jungle for homes. This will impact on waste, flooding, wildlife (hares, stags, partridges, buzzards, hawks are all present in this land) and ALL residents quality of life and that is before discussing the pollution from additional cars, homes, lights etc. We are fortunate to have the Gamston Airport site within our village. As you are aware it has been on its current site for many years and predates many of the residents who live or have moved to the village. It states in the Bassetlaw Plan that one positive outcome of new housings developments on the site will be to reduce aircraft noise. I would like to make it known that there is currently very limited 'noise' from the airfield. If we lose this valuable local asset the air-space restrictions will be lifted and we will get INCREASED noise from lower flying larger commercial aircraft out of Doncaster.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP532	Gareth Evans		<p>The current suggestion of 2 garden villages so close to each other is ludicrous and does not constitute a 'balanced growth' or 'spreading the population' throughout Bassetlaw as has been identified in the Plan. When you look at Map on Page 33 of the Plan it clearly shows towns and villages occupy both the northern and southern half of the region with area to the south and east of Worksop and to the east Retford being underdeveloped. Whilst I support the proposal of residential dwellings on the old Bevercoates Pit site due to its previous use, I do not support the Garden Village proposal at Gamston Airport. We are fortunate to have a growing industry and a highly skilled workforce present at the airfield in our community. We should be encouraging children and students to strive for such employment opportunities so Bassetlaw can 'lead the way' encouraging and supporting viable businesses for the benefit and future growth of our local economy (as implied in the Plan). We should not be instrumental in closing such specialist businesses and in turn diminishing current and future employment opportunities for residents. Why should residents of Bassetlaw only aspire to be employed in low skilled/ low paid roles that are so common today? I am aware there is space around the airfield currently that can be used for light industrial operations and truly believe that with the existing infrastructure to the A1 and HGV's not needing to come through the village, this would be the better option. The Bassetlaw Plan does not plan for the future, specialist highly skilled industry needs to be encouraged and taken advantage of, as does the expansion of viable businesses (as stated in the Plan) that already occupy the Gamston Airfield site.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP532	Gareth Evans		<p>Having previously lived in a 'Garden Village' I have first-hand experience of the planning and on-going development issues such villages bring. For ease I have put comments under specific headings below to highlight issues I believe will also become a problem with the Gamston Garden Village site - The layout of dwellings and the design of road networks were ill thought through, 90 degree sharp bends, a maze of through-roads and cul-de-sacs. Steep inclines making winter mornings lethal (no council grit service) if you could get off the estate at all. With minimal parking provided and garages built to 70's regulations (which means modern cars don't fit in them) means cars, vans, motorhomes, caravans are all forced to park on the narrow roads. This in turn made estate roads single lane traffic. Parking - mildly concerning in the early years of the development (as above) but as the children born on the estate mature the number of cars per household increase, coupled with children living at home for longer (due to cost of University and the majority of work locally being low skill/low pay so unable to afford their own homes) often meant those '2.4 households with 6 journeys per day' ended having at least 4 cars with 18 journeys per day (as no public transport links) and that was before they have visitors! Our neighbours in a 5 bed house actually had 7 cars, 5 of which parked on the road! Facilities promised in original plans – shop/pub/community centre/nursery/ play-parks/ Doctor etc (as the local council had instructed to be part and parcel of the development opportunity) never materialised. Even to this day some 10+ years after we moved onto the estate residents are still fighting for a basic play-park to be erected. This is due to developers arguing that it isn't their responsibility even though it was in initial planning documentation. Please do not be so naïve to believe the plans BDC put in will not be changed at a later date by an uprising of new residents. Light industrial units were scrapped in favour of more housing and amenities (which still haven't materialised). Residents use health services in neighbouring villages (which are already full). The promised improved education also did not materialise with locals instead travelling between 2 and 15 miles in a car to other provisions. Some 15+ years after phase 1 of the afore mentioned garden village development the local parish council continues to address the below issues - The roads in the new development appear to be too narrow and of unsuitable layout (90° bends) to allow for safe access of emergency services and utilities. No bus stops are planned. The nearest bus stop on First Avenue is a ten minute walk away and requires crossing the busy Cavendish Road. The whole of Cavendish Estate still only has one access route. Emergency services may not be able to reach the estate. Still no amenities such as shops, schools etc have been added to the plans The open space with play park needs better access. The access should face the direction of the main anticipated traffic flow of potential users. There should be four exits in total to keep children safe and allow safe exit routes in case of bullying incidents or similar. A pavement all around the open space should allow for safe access to the park. The plans show several properties with only one car parking space. Without suitable connection to public transport residents are likely to be relying on more than one car per household. Any surplus vehicles would be parked on the road adding to car parking and emergency access problems.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP532	Gareth Evans		<p>For 3 years we battled to get a broadband provider as local telephone exchanges were at capacity. This meant our exchange was some miles away from the estate. This in turn meant broadband speeds under 0.5mbps which under current legislation meant no one would provide to us. It took complaints to Communications Ombudsman to start the ball rolling – additional stress which we didn't need especially as I ran my own business from home. Ambulance and Fire services struggle to get onto the estate partially due to lay out and partially due to parked cars. There is only one entry/exit point meaning it can effectively be cut off. Due to the intrinsic nature of the development locals felt truly pushed out as their prime leisure and dog walking areas were built upon. Green spaces incorporated into the design are affectively used for dog fouling. There is still very much an 'US and THEM' feel and the development lacked any community feel. Many people didn't know neighbours as it was and still is a commuter village (town). Immediate local economy provides a high proportion of low skilled low paid work and so prices the 'locals' out. Due to most households commuting many residents choose to spend their money in areas nearer their work place (for example food/ leisure shopping). You only need to look at the severe decline of Mansfield Town centre to acknowledge this. Such a large percentage of households commuting has left the area like a 'ghost town' for the majority of the day (7am-7pm), a race track from 5pm onwards and a car park at the evenings and weekends. This makes it unsafe for children to 'play out'. Leisure time is also more diverse, using local country parks to dog-walk but spending money on days out further afield – Sheffield, Birmingham, Nottingham, Chesterfield etc.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP532	Gareth Evans		<p>Moved to this village to escape the 'Garden Village' (Town) we previously resided in. To allow our children to grow up in a rural location, a place where they can play out without fear of fast cars, parked cars and dangerous roads. An area that is cleaner with reduced pollution, which is part of a community where neighbours look out for each other. We now spend more time together as a family (not less as the plan states) exploring local footpaths and star-gazing - as there is CURRENTLY limited light pollution. Would like my children to grow and be part of our active community where opportunities for education, employment and lifestyle are expected to an exemplary standard. Where Bassetlaw defies national trends for low paid/low skilled roles and strives for highly skilled highly paid employment which in turn seeks to bring prosperity to all who reside and are employed here.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP533	991230		<p>Do not support.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>
DBLP534	991231		<p>Do not support.</p>	<p>The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.</p>

DBLP535	991234		Support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP536	991235		Do not support. To describe the proposal as 'garden villages' is misleading, as is the New Settlement Study which is alarmingly incorrect in many areas. Why build a town in the middle of the Nottinghamshire countryside? It makes no sense at all. We should be preserving our rural heritage, not turning it into a large urban development. The infrastructure will need to be massively enhanced to cope with this. This includes the roads and other services such as hospitals and the policing of it all which cannot possibly cope with the extra burden.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP537	991237		Do not support. The scale of increase in properties in these locations will destroy the actual villages in the vicinity. Gamston, Eaton, Rockley, West Drayton and East Markham will have their population essentially increased from a few hundred to several thousand. Completely contradictory to the 20% maximum that is stated in the plan. The road infrastructure in these locations, which currently can't cope with the existing volume of traffic, will be dangerous areas to live. Eaton currently has damage to the bridge after a road accident, the bridge was also closed in 2017 due to a vehicle colliding with the bridge. There have been a number of road traffic accidents and vehicles have knocked down street lights when the bridge at Ordsall was temporary closed. The road through Eaton is unable to cope with the current volume of traffic and the speeds that people drive at. With any increase in this the chance of a fatality on this road is only a matter of time. Eaton also has limited pavements, with the gate to our property opening straight on to the road with vehicles regularly passing at 40-50 MPH in a 30 MPH zone. This will only get worse and more dangerous with any increase in traffic in the locality. Current traffic volumes are around 100 vehicles per hour... Mon 4/3/19 - 8-9am - 113 vehicles Mon 4/3/19 - 4-5pm - 118 vehicles Fri 8/3/19 - 8-9am - 113 vehicles Fri 8/3/19 - 4-5pm - 117 vehicles With these volumes there a multiple accidents a month, near misses and hourly incidents of people driving at significantly over the speed limit. Increasing properties in close proximity to Eaton from around 100 to nearly 6000 would have to result in access through Eaton being stopped.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP538	991240		Do not support. A consequence of meeting targets and budgets will mean that this will be one of the first areas of the new development which will be decreased. I also wonder about the demand, there are a number of existing sites which remain empty and unused, we should aim to fill these first surely? Would the Tuxford based industries not benefit more from being relocated to the proposed sites for the 2 New villages as this would put them closer to major road networks and remove the need for HGVs to be routed through Tuxford? Also, new homes being built on the industrial site in Tuxford (once businesses had been relocated). Would mean that the additional traffic, people, demand on local resources would be more equally distributed between Retford and Tuxford.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP539	991241		Do not support. Why would viable businesses and the airport employment of specialist worker be destroyed. No risk assessments on rural road have taken place. 6 additional journeys per household every day on unsuitable roads. Insufficient public transport and the garden villages can not access railways easily. No air quality assessment has taken place. The area has insufficient health service for ever the stage 1. The plan should be protecting rural locations ! Also the Airport development would be directly tagging on to Muttonshire Hill which is not recommended.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP540	991243		Do not support. As above the loss of Gamston Airport is too much for me to agree to this. I live nearby, I access Gamston Airport frequently and I can not see why you're willing to throw local aviation away so easily.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP541	991264		Support. But not at the expense of an existing employment and business location. New developments are meant to add to facilities and not to merely replace one existing and active facility with housing just to avoid any perception of planning issues.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP542	991336		Support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP543	991990		Do not support. This airfield is a VITAL part of the flying training infrastructure of the UK. The council should be leading the fight to PROTECT it from development.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP544	992014		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.

DBLP545	992366		Support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP546	992635		Do not support. The plan will destroy nationally important aviation infrastructure leading to the loss of advanced technology and engineering businesses and pilot training. It will also leave the Children's Air Ambulance without a base in the Retford area and will result in the loss of approximately 100 highly skilled jobs.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP547	993337		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP548	993387		Do not support.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation: Policies 13-16				
DBLP2	Miss S Gaskell		Supports the policies seeking to address climate change. Will there be renewable energy	There will be a renewable energy policy within the Local Plan which will be informed by responses to the consultation and the site allocations assessment.
DBLP16	Mr T Bray		Supports the policies seeking to address climate change.	Support for policy welcomed.
DBLP24	F Ieromino		Supports the policies seeking to address climate change.	Support for policy welcomed.
DBLP31	Clir J Ogle		Does not support the policies seeking to address climate change.	Support for policy welcomed.
DBLP32	H Bennett		Supports the policies seeking to address climate change.	Support for policy welcomed.
DBLP37		Marine Management Organsation	The East Marine Plan contains a number of policies that are relevant to policies highlighted in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The following east plan policies may be relevant to policies 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 24 within the Draft Bassetlaw Plan: CC1, CC2, SOC2, SOC3, BIO1, BIO2, ECO1, GOV1. Recommend you consult East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System for further information.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will ensure that East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System are consulted as the plan progresses.
DBLP37		Marine Management Organsation	The East Marine Plan contains a number of policies that are relevant to policies highlighted in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The following east plan policies may be relevant to policies 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 24 within the Draft Bassetlaw Plan: CC1, CC2, SOC2, SOC3, BIO1, BIO2, ECO1, GOV1. Recommend you consult East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System for further information.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will ensure that East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System are consulted as the plan progresses.
DBLP60	S Lilley	Nottinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service	Will the potential planned more efficient use of domestic water in the new garden village developments, affect the supply, size of mains, flow and pressure?	It shouldn't affect the supply, size of mains or water pressure but it is likely to affect the flow of water.
DBLP135	S Parker		Why in hell are you destroying a business and recreational asset in the community when you have a dozen brown field sites surrounding this complex. There are building projects on disused pit sites at Cotgrave and Gedling that would better suit this area. There is legislation in Parliament at this time aimed at stopping the destruction of our airfields that are a national asset. If you are hell bent on choosing an airfield why not choose a disused one such as Ossington near by.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council is currently reviewing the spatial strategy and will make amendments where necessary.
DBLP138	L Carter	Bothamsall Parish Council	Supports the policies seeking to address climate change.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP144	P Eaglen		Support the proposed policies that seek to address climate change.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP150	C Grainger		All new houses built in Bassetlaw and any major house extensions should have to incorporate solar panels in their designs and be built to the highest standard of thermal insulation. My solar installation is a modest under 4kw system, but have generated 24000kwh over the last 7 years. If the 6630 houses required 2018-2035 all did this, that would generate 22 million kwh per year. No builder will volunteer to do this we need a strategy that makes them to do it for the sake of future generations	The Local Plan has policies to support the generation of small scale and local renewable energy generation.
DBLP170	M Malcolm	East Markham Parish Council	Does not take into account surface water runoff from a number of small developments in rural areas. BDC should work with developers irrespective of size to ensure installation of SuDS. This will ensure that the drainage systems in no area of Bassetlaw will be overwhelmed in times of heavy rainfall.	Cumulative impact is taken into consideration. It is a requirement of national policy (paragraph 156, NPPF).
DBLP182	D Bramley	Severn Trent Water Ltd	Support. In particular the requirement to include SuDS, ensure that they have an appropriate management and maintenance arrangements and do not discharge surface water into the sewerage system. Welcome the inclusion of SuDS in green infrastructure with the aim of providing wider biodiversity and amenity benefits along with flood storage volumes. Expect surface water to be managed in line with the Government's Water Strategy, Future Water. The strategy sets out a vision for more effective management of surface water to deal with the dual pressures of climate change and housing development. Surface water needs to be managed sustainably. For new developments would not expect surface water to be conveyed to our foul or combined sewage system and, where practicable, support the removal of surface water already connected to foul or combined sewer. Greater emphasis needs to be paid to consequences of extreme rainfall. In the past, even outside of the flood plain, some properties have been built in natural drainage paths. Request that developers providing sewers on new developments should safely accommodate floods which exceed the design capacity of the sewers. To encourage developers to consider sustainable drainage, Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the sewerage infrastructure charge if there is no surface water connection and a 75% discount if there is a surface water connection via a sustainable drainage system.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council will continue to liaise with infrastructure providers to ensure the policies in the Plan are appropriate and compliant with national policy and guidance.
DBLP183	R Millbank	Environment Agency	Fully support this Policy and consider it sound. Particularly supportive of the recognition that new development must not increase flood risk to either the development and future occupants themselves, or third parties. Support the statement that 'less vulnerable' and 'more vulnerable' development will not be supported in areas of Flood Zone 3b which is defined as functional floodplain. Recognise that there are no significant proposals to regenerate areas in the functional floodplain, which is a positive with regards to flood risk. Recommend that additional wording should be added to the supporting text, perhaps as a new paragraph '13.14'. Like to the Plan to encourage applicants and developers to approach the Environment Agency directly, for pre application advice, when development is being proposed in high flood risk areas. Anecdotal evidence shows that this ultimately results in less delays at the formal planning application stage. Applicants are strongly encouraged to approach us via email at planning.trentside@environment-agency.gov.uk.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Propose to include the following text in the Plan: "Applicants and developers may wish to approach the Environment Agency directly for pre application advice when development is being proposed in high flood risk areas."
DBLP184	M Speck	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Section 4. SuDS states proposals should: g) Where appropriate, provide natural flood management and mitigation through improvement or creation of green infrastructure. Wish to point out the potential biodiversity value of SuDS (Chapter 6 of Ciria SuDS Manual) and would expect to see reference to the existence of this guidance and the potential biodiversity value of SuDS in the supporting text.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Guidance often becomes out of date or update so it is not considered appropriate to make reference to the Ciria SuDS Manual. It is proposed that the text will make reference to the benefits that SuDS provide for biodiversity.
DBLP182	D Bramley	Severn Trent Water Ltd	Welcome the use of the optional Lower water consumption targets (110 Litres/person/day) outlined within Part G of the Building Regulations.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP182	D Bramley	Severn Trent Water Ltd	Support para 13.23 and the need to protect watercourse and groundwater from pollution. Generally supportive of Policy 16 the inclusion of the optional water efficiency target and water reuse. Question if the policy needs to include the 'optional' element of the statement in favour of a stronger statement, given para 2.8 of Building Regulations Part G (2015 edition with 2016 amendments) states: "The optional requirement only applies where a condition that the dwelling should meet the optional requirement is imposed as part of the process of granting planning permission. Where it applies, the estimated consumption of wholesome water calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator, should not exceed 110 litres/person/day." Support the water quality section, it is particularly important because for development to be carried out sustainably in line with the principle objectives of NPPF, it is essential that the water resources and systems in the local area are protected to deliver housing growth and maintain current standards of living for future generations. Development should not be permitted where it could cause a detriment to water quality, particularly within Source Protection Zones (SPZ) as deterioration of water quality in these areas presents a risk to water supply capacity. Good quality river water and groundwater is vital for provision of good quality drinking water. The Environment Agency's Source Protection Zone (SPZ) and Safe Guarding Zone policy should provide guidance on development. Any proposals should take into account the principles of the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plan for the Severn River basin unit.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP183	R Millbank	Environment Agency	In terms of Part A, fully support the intention to incorporate the tighter water efficiency measures. For the avoidance of doubt, fully prepared to support BDC at the subsequent EIP to defend the inclusion of this measure. It is absolutely necessary, and whilst the supporting text does an excellent job of setting this out, have further evidence which could assist if necessary. A previous government report clearly states that these tighter water efficiency measures can be incorporated by developers at a rough cost of £9 per dwelling; it is not within our remit to comment on matters of viability, do not consider that a showstopper by any means. In terms of Part B, support the opening paragraph which makes reference to the WFD, it would be good for the Policy to include a reference to ongoing projects which are looking to enhance rivers for WFD. Suggest the following could be added to the end of the paragraph: 'In line with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive, development must not result in any waterbody failing to meet the element and overall class status set out in the Humber River Basin Management Plan. Where possible, development should actively contribute to enhancing the status of the waterbody through positive actions or ongoing projects'. Whilst improving water quality is one of the most important elements to the WFD, there are also physical modifications to watercourses which have the potential to impact on WFD status. For example, culverting, straightening, desilting etc. Would like to see this referenced in this section as it is all part of the WFD process. Suggest the following wording added to bullet point '1': '1. Development will be permitted where proposals will not have a negative impact on water quality directly through pollution of surface or ground water. Development will not be permitted where it includes the physical modification of a waterbody such that it impacts upon the WFD status of that waterbody and causes a deterioration in status.'	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	Welcome the inclusion in this policy of the preference for SuDs which were possible will provide multifunctional benefits, this could include more specific reference to SuDs contributing to the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity. Plans should positively contribute to reducing flood risk by working with natural processes and where possible use Green Infrastructure policies and the provision of SuDs to achieve this.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. It is proposed that the text will make reference to the benefits that SuDs provide for biodiversity.
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	Supports Policy 16 part B which will ensure development must not result in any waterbody failing to meet the element and overall class status set out in the Humber River Basin Management Plan. Welcome the inclusion of the Humber River Basin Management Plan to inform the development proposed in the Local Plan. Support the inclusion of not permitting development where the drainage of surface water could adversely affect areas important for biodiversity. Welcome an extension of this policy to include protecting habitats from water related impacts and where appropriate seeking enhancement. Priority for enhancements should be focussed on European Sites, SSSIs and local sites which contribute to a wider ecological network.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP191	K Miller	National Trust	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP191	K Miller	National Trust	Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP194	H Leggett	Emery Planning on behalf of J G Pears Property Ltd	Policies 13 and 14 focus on energy efficiency in construction and development of new low carbon and energy schemes. Support the aims and objectives of these policies. The Plan fails to take opportunities offered by existing energy efficient locations, such as High Marnham which as they already exist offer the most sustainable opportunities to power future development. The Former High Marnham Power Station site provides an excellent opportunity to positively and actively meet the aims of this Section of the Plan with its accessibility to the national Grid connection and critically potential for reuse of excess power, heat and hot water from J G Pears Low Marnham CHP. This unique opportunity should be grasped by the LPA and, accordingly the Policies should be combined or expanded to include a presumption in favour of reuse of existing energy efficient sites which already provide opportunities for decentralised energy. In consideration of Part 2 of the Local Plan significant weight should be attached to this benefit and this site should be allocated for employment or other uses.	
DBLP221	B Weedall	Gladman Developments	Do not consider that the requirement for the higher water efficiency standard to be appropriate. The Written Ministerial Statement (25th March 2015) makes clear that the optional technical standards should only be required if there is a clearly evidenced based need for them, and where their impact on viability has been considered. Paragraph 13.18 confirms that the areas in Bassetlaw covered by Severn Trent Water (within which some sites are located) are not classed as water stressed areas. As such, the policy is not soundly based as it is not supported by appropriate evidence for all site locations. B3 duplicates some of the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991, which places a statutory requirement on water companies. Developments pay a connection charge and yearly charges for foul but the water treatment is for the Water Authority statutory duties and via their EA licencing. Suggest this paragraph is reworded to avoid passing the statutory requirements onto developers and housebuilders. It is not apparent from B4 the circumstances that the Council are seeking to address and no adverse affects at all is a very high bar. Needs more explanation and flexibility otherwise it could be imposing far more onerous requirement than development sites achieving an overall net gain in biodiversity.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council has evidence to support this approach. This will be clarified in the Plan.
DBLP229	S Ashton		Supports the policies seeking to address climate change.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP232	N Oldbury	Elkesley Parish Council	Surprised that very little alternative sources of green energy are included. The plan highlights Solar energy fields will be supported and housing should be designed with good "solar access". There is no mention of any other alternatives like Air Source heat pumps or ground source heat pumps, which could be done at the building stage, and would provide a significant saving to reduce the reliance on fossil fuels, mitigating climate change. Would like to see a comprehensive policy regarding the use of all alternative energy sources and not just solar within the building process not just for housing but any development within the area. BDC can set these markers higher than the stated norm, and would like to see that done to encourage excellent buildings being built within the district, encouraging people to want to live here. There is no mention of electric vehicle charging points in local towns and villages apart from those proposed in the North Nottingham Garden Villages. There is no point supplying charging points in development unless additional charging areas are available district wide. Would like to see a comprehensive policy for the support of electric vehicles.	
DBLP262	S Patience	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Anglian Water is supportive of the requirement to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems as part of the design of new developments which will help to address sewer flooding and surface water flooding.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP255	S Green	Home Builders Federation	All new dwellings achieve a mandatory level of water efficiency of 125 litres per day per person under Building Regulations which is higher than that achieved by much of the existing housing stock. The WMS 25th March 2015 confirmed that "the optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the NPPG". The Council should justify the requirement for the higher water efficiency standard in accordance with the criteria set out in the NPPG (ID 56-013 to 56-017). The Housing Standards Review was explicit that reduced water consumption was solely applicable to water stressed areas. The Council's evidence states that areas in Bassetlaw covered by Severn Trent Water are not classed as water stressed. The Council should also clarify if Bassetlaw District is totally or only partially in the area covered by Anglian Water which is classed as an area of serious water stress. This policy requirement should be modified before the publication of the pre-submission Local Plan consultation.	Whilst the Housing Standards Review may have indicated that reduced water consumption was solely applicable to water stressed areas, the PPG indicates (Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 56-015-20150327) that: 'It will be for a local planning authority to establish a clear need based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> existing sources of evidence. consultations with the local water and sewerage company, the Environment Agency and catchment partnerships. See paragraph 003 of the water supply guidance consideration of the impact on viability and housing supply of such a requirement.' The Environment Agency, Severn Trent Water, and Anglian Water fully support this policy and consider that it is necessary. The Council has evidence to demonstrate that it is required in Bassetlaw.
DBLP262	S Patience	Anglian Water Services Ltd	A. Maximising Water Efficiency: Anglian Water is supportive of Policy 16 as it states that all new residential development in the District should achieve the optional technical standard in terms of water efficiency of 110 litres/person/day. The Environment Agency has identified the Anglian Water region as an area of serious water stress, and support the adoption of the higher standard of water efficiency. Government research (The Housing Standards Review Cost Impact report, 2014) has shown that the cost of the optional higher water efficiency standard and associated cost can be as low as £6-9 per dwelling. The optional higher water efficiency standard has also been successfully adopted in a number of local plans in Anglian Water company area. Consider that this does not make the Plan, or individual development proposals, unviable. Local Planning Authorities are able to adopt the higher optional standard for water efficiency where there is clear 'local need' as identified in the NPPG. Policy 16 refers to this standard and the water efficiency standard which would apply by default. To ensure the policy is effective suggest removing the reference to default standard for water efficiency (125 litres/per person/per day) as the policy suggests that both water efficiency standards would apply. Suggest that the reference to water efficiency/re-use measures be included in Policy 16 to encourage residential development to improve upon the optional higher water efficiency standard. It is proposed that paragraph 'a' of Policy 16 be amended as follows: 'To promote water efficiency, new developments will be required to minimise water consumption by meeting the tighter Building Regulations optional requirement of 110 litres/person/day (in addition to the 125 litres/person/day mandatory standard) Water recycling, rainwater and stormwater harvesting should also be incorporated wherever feasible to reduce demand on mains water supply.' B. Promoting Water Quality: Anglian Water is supportive of Policy 16 as it requires that development proposals must be served by an adequate supply of water, sewerage infrastructure and sufficient sewage treatment capacity.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Agree with amendment to remove the reference to 125 litres per person per day from the policy.
DBLP270	D Troop		The relevant NPPF policy is not identified and in an area of low viability, new build delivery beyond Building Regs is unlikely	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP271	Anonymous		Supported. These new builds should include solar panels, not just water meters.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP270	D Troop		15.2a will allow Marina Development to occur because it is "water compatible"	Thank you for your comments which are noted. This is not considered necessary because Policy 15, 2a identifies 'water compatible' development as being appropriate.
DBLP270	D Troop		Pusto Hill aquafer is located within Everton Parish with the adjacent water pumping/treatment plant ensuring that the water is distributed to a range of settlements in Bassetlaw. Everton Parish is making this important natural resource available to settlements being awarded excessive growth potential (see later). To class Everton as suffering from "serious water stress" is incorrect when this hitherto Rural Service Centre possesses surplus water supply. Meeting tighter building regulations should not be necessary here. The local validation checklist for Bassetlaw states the following: For applications other than minor extensions Core Strategy Policy DM12: Flood risk, sewerage and drainage requires applicants to demonstrate that development will not exacerbate existing land drainage and sewerage problems in: • Beckingham • Clarbrough and Hayton • East Drayton • East Markham • Harworth Bircotes • North Leverton • North Wheatley • Misterton • South Wheatley • Sturton-le-Steeple • Welham • Wakeringham Yet all of these settlements are proposed to receive the same level (or more) growth than Everton. Beyond the 30 small settlements deemed inappropriate for growth, the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan 2019, fails to distinguish BETWEEN the 73 Rural Settlements identified as appropriate for growth. This is regardless of sewerage capacity, water provision, school provision etc etc etc.....The draft Bassetlaw Plan must acknowledge that differing levels of growth will be required between the 73 Rural Settlements.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Everton is served by Anglian Water. Areas covered by Anglian Water are classed as in water stress (as identified by the EA). The approach taken is considered to be appropriate.
DBLP273	J. Rogers	Friends of Woodlands and Coachwood Green Ltd	Shireoaks is liable to flooding from the River Ryton and all developments should attempt to minimise the impact on drainage and sewerage networks to increase the resilience to climate change.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The policies in the plan seek to address surface water drainage. No amendment required.
DBLP273	J. Rogers	Friends of Woodlands and Coachwood Green Ltd	Woodlands Country Park (WCP) is a designated wildlife site at the heart of Shireoaks and is evolving as a health and wellbeing asset for Bassetlaw. WCP has unique natural environment properties as well as a wealth of history and heritage assets. Critical to maintaining and enhancing the biodiversity of WCP is the protection of the wildlife corridors from nearby Sites of Special Scientific Interest; to feed the developing wildlife in its unusual mosaic of habitats. These corridors should adhere to the specifications advised by Notts Wildlife Trust.	
DBLP273	J. Rogers	Friends of Woodlands and Coachwood Green Ltd	The boundary of the conservation area in Shireoaks should be expanded to include Woodlands and Coachwood Green which should be designated as Local Green Spaces. Protection of these green spaces including the ancient allotments should protected from residential development.	
DBLP301	977042		Support for policies which address climate change. There should be no fracking and more recycling.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP296	975737		Support for policies which address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP297	975757		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP303	978627		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP304	986292		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP308	986480		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP311	986993		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP314	987642		Support for policies which seek to address climate change. Although this is an area that will need to be reviewed every five years not 15. appreciate it may be a more time consuming and challenging process to identify how the government housing targets may be met solely by opportunities the existing town centres and villages, and in turn prove more challenging to impose leives on developers in order to provide key infrastructure requirements. I believe by focusing on the communities we already have the overall benefit would be to improve and enhance what Bassetlaw already has rather than attempting to create garden villages with the potential to leave the communities, old and new with more diluted, less focuses services and facilities. By focusing on the communities we already have the overall benefit would be to improve and enhance what Bassetlaw already has rather than attempting to create garden villages with the potential to leave the communities, old and new with more diluted, less focuses services and facilities. If this is a consultation why is this being said ? see photo attached	The Council is strongly embracing the national green agenda and has recently updated its Council Plan. The Local Plan is also strongly supporting the low carbon economy within its policies and will form a central part to its objectives.
DBLP315	987680		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP317	987880		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP318	987892		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP319	987959		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP321	988036		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP323	988047		Only support policy which seeks to address climate change.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP330	988064		Support for policies which seek to address climate change provided it wouldn't result in the loss of Gamston Airfield.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP336	988172		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP344	988235		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP345	988237		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP349	988325		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP350	988344		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP351	988346		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP352	988350		Only support policies addressing climate change and delivering and safeguarding infrastructure.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		This policy can have a major effect on some smaller settlement's ability to deliver housing and meet their 10_20% requirements.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council has worked closely with infrastructure providers to ensure that the plan will deliver any necessary infrastructure improvements associated with development.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Overall this policy is welcomed, but this policy takes no account of the existing woefully weak water / sewerage systems in the smaller more rural settlements.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council has worked closely with infrastructure providers to ensure that the plan will deliver any necessary infrastructure improvements associated with development.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Support for climate change policies. But will have an effect on the deliverability of the housing requirement.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP362	988481		Support for climate change policies. But will have an effect on the deliverability of the housing requirement.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP363	988482		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP364	988487		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP371	988500		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP372	988501		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP373	988503		Support for policies which seek to address climate change. Making new homes more eco-friendly is an excellent plan. Making new homes where there is already an airfield does not make sense in my mind.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP375	988527		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP376	988557		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP379	988630		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP384	988726		We are supportive of any reasonable policies to support the issue of climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP386	988747		Support climate change policies. I believe in addressing climate change and there should be development by the Council in sustainable energy eg solar farms , again these could be sited on vacant poor quality agricultural land. There should also be development in transport infrastructure and perhaps for old railway stations eg Tuxford to be reopened so that more sustainable commuting is possible and road traffic reduced.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP387	988748		No support for climate change policies. Building new house with limited road infrastructure will increase emissions from construction and later on traffic congestion caused by poor design and too many vehicles using the site compare to present airfield activity.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council has worked closely with infrastructure providers to ensure that the plan will deliver any necessary infrastructure improvements associated with development.
DBLP388	988749		Support for policies which seek to address climate change. But should go further.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The policy is currently being reviewed to determine if it can seek higher standards.
DBLP391	988813		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP392	988889		No support for climate change policies. Climate change is addresses through incentives to decarbon existing infrastructure not penalise those who have little choice or ability or knowledge to change their current situation	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council has worked closely with infrastructure providers to ensure that the plan will deliver any necessary infrastructure improvements associated with development.

DBLP393	989007		Support for climate change policies. Every new house built should have solar panels as a building requirement. Lets start with some regulations that will actually contribute and mean something.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. The Council has worked closely with infrastructure providers to ensure that the plan will deliver any necessary infrastructure improvements associated with development.
DBLP394	989023		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP398	989658		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP399	989741		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP402	990030		No support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP403	990043		Support for policies which seek to address climate change. This is difficult as central government is muddy over this issue	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP404	990059		Support for policies which seek to address climate change. This is difficult as central government is muddy over this issue	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP405	990062		Support for policies which seek to address climate change. The objectives of policy 13 are commendable but there is little detail or substance in explaining in reality how this will actually be achieved. Bassetlaw and Nottinghamshire are amongst the worst authorities in the country for things such as re-cycling which has an impact on climate change. As an example, solar panels should be installed as energy efficient sound barriers at the side of Elkesley.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. levery area is different and there are a number of mitigation solutions to address climate change. The suggestion of installing solar panels, whilst laudable, is too prescriptive. A more nuanced approach is considered appropriate in this respect.
DBLP407	990068		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP408	990070		Don't support climate change policies. The volumes of housing outweighs suggested plan.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. In terms of achieving sustainable development, the planning system has three overarching objectives: to deliver the social infrastructure to meet the needs of communities, to contribute towards the protection of the natural environment, and to promote a strong economy. Housing provides for the social needs of the community. The plan seeks to ensure that it is designed in such a way as to address the effects of climate change. It also has a positive effect on the local economy by providing jobs and supporting local services.
DBLP410	990076		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP411	990079		Support for policies which seek to address climate change. The policies are fine but the way they are proposing the implementation I do not support. Decimating the countryside is NOT environmentally friendly .	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP415	990150		The respondent supports the approach to Policies 13, 14 and 15. As a major landowner in the District they welcome support for appropriately located and unobtrusive low carbon and renewable energy schemes where they will not result in unacceptable impacts on environmental amenity or the character of the built and natural environment.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP416	990240		Support for policies which seek to address climate change. This is a "no-brainer". All Authorities and Individuals should be concerned and be taking action to 'address Climate Change'. With this in mind, it is difficult to understand why Rural Villages are being compelled to accommodate more housing when this then creates more vehicle journeys (stated as per 6 per household per day). With regards to Bothamsall, under the Current Plan it is a Village that cannot sustain further development. With the wave of a 'magic wand' Bothamsall IS now able to sustain further development having 'lost' the facilities of a Shop, Post Office and useful Bus Service. I do not believe that the addition of a few houses will bring these back to Bothamsall. These extra vehicles will create even more pollution and thus be effective in the acceleration of Climate Change. The wide use of Electric Cars is still a long way off, and it is interesting to note that when such vehicles are 'championed' there is not any mention of where or how all of this additional Electricity is to be generated.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Development in Bothamsall could help to sustain services in other nearby villages, such as Walesby. This approach is advocated by national planning policy (Paragraph 78, NPPF).
DBLP418	990387		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP419	990400		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP420	990465		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP421	990489		Support for policies which seek to address climate change	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP422	990506		Don't support policies which seek to address climate change	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP423	990541		Don't support climate change policies. There are many policies, so I would need to know which ones are referred to in this instance.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP425	990570		Don't support. I'm saying this because the council station ends in two days and I don't have much time but based on the bit that I have read I assume the rest of it is not very well thought through.	Comments noted.
DBLP424	990549		Support policies which seek to address climate change	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP426	990571		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP427	990577		Support. Building on new greenfield sites and Gamston Airport is incompatible with green intentions. More roads, more vehicles and less green space. Urban sprawl.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP428	990594		Don't support. as stated this development is in the wrong area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP429	990613		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP430	990614		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP431	990633		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP434	990659		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP435	990666		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP436	990682		Support. However. Your proposals are incompatible with you aims in utilization and airfield which is a haven for our rapidly diminishing wildlife.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Nature conservation is taken into consideration in planning decisions on development. Any adverse affects would need to be addressed where necessary.
DBLP437	990704		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP438	990717		Don't support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP439	990719		Don't support. protect what we have not growth of cement citys!	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP440	990764		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP441	990783		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP442	990799		Support. Yes, if Gamston village is not constructed.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP443	990800		Support. On the whole FCC support the policies that seek to conserve and enhance the natural and built environment. Policy 19: Protecting Biodiversity and Geodiversity, confirms that development likely to result in the loss, deterioration or harm to habitats or species of importance to biodiversity or geological conversation interests, either directly or indirectly, will not be permitted unless certain criteria are met. FCC support this policy as it acknowledges that the need for, and benefits of the development can outweigh the adverse effect in relation to biodiversity providing appropriate mitigation can be provided. This is in accordance with the NPPF which states at Paragraph 170 that planning policies should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan). Policy 22: Design is also supported as it acknowledges that the Council will support development of a good quality design which positively contributes to the appearance of the area. The Policy goes on to set out a list of criteria which development proposals are required to adhere to in order to achieve good quality design. The development of FCC's site at Carlton Forest will be well designed in order to respond to the semi-rural character of the area.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP444	990802		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. One of the Strategic Objectives relates to the 'protection of the intrinsic character of the countryside'. I do not consider that it will be protected with 1000 houses concentrated in a rural area over 15 years and subsequently a further 3000 houses over the next 15 or so years. The proposed areas are close to local and regional popular leisure, heritage and historical tourist area with such attractions as the Dukeries, Clumber Park and Sherwood Forest. I consider that these housing developments will spoil the attraction to these unique places and locally will urbanise an area known for its rolling green farmland and beautiful landscapes.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP445	990806		Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP446	990814		Support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP446	990814		Do not support. Para 13.12 directly associates flooding of rivers in the down to climate change. This is a crass statement jumping on the bandwagon without any forethought. Rivers have flooded in this area for many years even before the term climate change has become the catch all for any natural phenomena.	Whilst it is acknowledged that flooding has historically occurred, there is growing evidence that climate change is resulting in more frequent flooding events. Paragraph 4.4 of the Bassetlaw SFRA identifies that climate change is expected to increase the frequency, extent and impact of flooding, reflected in peak river flows. Wetter winters and more intense rainfall may increase fluvial flooding and surface water runoff and there may be increased storm intensity in summer. Increased river levels may also increase flood risk.
DBLP447	990818		Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP448	990826		Support. Any policies that seek to improve the environment are welcome.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP449	990829		Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP450	990836		Do not support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP451	990837		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP452	990841		Do not support. Construction of these 2 towns would completely ruin the look and feel of the area. It would destroy the rural nature that exists presently.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP450	990836		Do not support. The policy to create housing that will necessitate the use of personal transport to reach facilities is as far from addressing climate change as you can get.	The Plan is seeking to ensure development is located in areas of need within the District. Locating development in rural areas will support local services and reduce the need to travel to access services elsewhere.
DBLP452	990841		Do not support. Whatever we do in this country to affect climate change is insignificant and almost completely irrelevant. If the entire UK disappeared under the waves the difference to the world's CO2 emissions would be 0.04%	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP453	990842		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP454	990843		support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP455	990845		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP456	990846		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP457	990847		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP458	990848		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP459	990849		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP460	990850		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP461	990852		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP462	990854		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP463	990855		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP464	990856		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP465	990859		Do not support. I cant support policies that ran we lose and important facility such as Gamston airport.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP466	990862		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP467	990865		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP468	990869		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP469	990882		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP470	990884		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP471	990885		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP472	990886		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP473	990889		Do not support. I fail to see how current farm land. Which turned in to a housing estate is a method to enhance natural environment.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP474	990891		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP475	990893		Do not support. No because they do not include conserving Gamston airfield as an airfield and green space.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP476	990895		Support. Contradicted by proposals to build two new towns at Gamston and Bevercotes. Both are rural, open countryside with considerable restoration woodland. While Gamston Airfield should be preserved as open green space and a viable airfield, Bevercotes is better suited to deliver biodiversity gains via offsetting and Section 106 agreements.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP477	990901		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP478	990904		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP479	990910		Do not support. The draft plan for Bassetlaw suggests that that council wishes to protect rural settlements and the natural environment. In doing so it needs to consider the best way of doing this in that services in rural communities are continuing to demise with little focus on economic opportunities and when investment is seen as essential to the continued success of rural communities this is not forthcoming.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP480	990912		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP481	990913		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP482	990914		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP483	990915		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP484	990916		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP485	990917		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP486	990918		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP487	990919		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP488	990921		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP489	990922		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP490	990926		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP491	990928		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP492	990930		Do not support. Destroying the airfield will take significant energy and a natural habit, not over farmed. Building on greenfield would use less energy.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP493	990933		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP494	990934		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP495	990936		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP496	990937		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP497	990938		Support. Again, not seen any information regarding this.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP498	990940		Support. The use of increasing amounts of renewable energy I agree with. However the rest of the plan seems to be centred around the building of increasingly energy efficient buildings.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP499	990942		Do not support. As part of these include a dividend for closing the airport which will not happen, this will simply move to other, more aviation friendly areas, Selby would welcome such facilities.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP500	990943		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP501	990944		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP502	990946		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP503	M Turner		Do not support. The draft plan fails to provide evidence how it will compel builders to build sustainable homes that do not in themselves further exacerbate climate change.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP504	990949		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP505	C Taylor		Support. Any proposal to improve the environment is welcome. It should not have to depend on 2 new villages being built.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP506	990952		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP507	990954		Support. The idea of the garden villages sounds excellent.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP508	990955		Do not support. No, see above!	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP509	990959		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP510	990961		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP516	991153		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP517	991157		Support. Yes any policies that work to protect the climate.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP518	991172		Do not support. Because I do not feel they have gone far enough. I believe BDC should be aiming higher and expecting developers reach passive rate housing alongside ground source and air source heat pumps run via solar. I also believe any plan needs to be district wide, so when you discuss electrical charging facilities it should not just be on new developments it needs to be throughout the district.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

DBLP519	991173		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP520	991174		Do not support. I do not feel the other policies have gone far enough. I believe BDC should be aiming higher and expecting developers reach passive rate housing alongside ground source and air source heat pumps run via solar, etc. I also believe any plan needs to be district wide, so when you discuss electrical charging facilities it should not just be on new developments it needs to be throughout the district.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP521	991176		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP522	991178		Support any policy that promotes energy efficiency , new builds where possible should use materials to address the use of renewable energy such as solar incorporated within the roofs , air and ground source heat pumps and provision to accommodate the future use of electric cars although these charging points need to be county and country wide for it to be successful.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP523	991181		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP524	991184		Do not support. Your proposals to build so many houses but without any supporting action plan for extensive growth in businesses and employment will actually contribute to exactly the opposite of addressing climate change issues. The building of such a large volume of houses will increase traffic congestion on major routes in and out of Bassetlaw with an increased number of people needing to commute for work beyond the 17,000 that you have already identified. That will add to both traffic and noise pollution and so will actually have a totally detrimental effect on climate change issues.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP525	991186		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP526	991188		Do not support. I have no comment on this.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP527	991190		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP528	991208		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP529	991209		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP530	991219		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP531	991221		Do not support. build the housing near existing regions with good rail links.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP532	Gareth Evans		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP533	991230		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP534	991231		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP535	991234		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP536	991235		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP537	991237		Support. Whilst the policies may be sound the reality of the sites delivered by the house builders is completely different. I do not believe that Bassetlaw will hold the developers to account in regards to the environmental impact of these sites or the green areas etc in these areas.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP538	991240		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP539	991241		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP540	991243		Do not support. At the risk of repeating myself if this new plan incorporates the loss of Gamston Airport then I can not agree to any part of it.	
DBLP541	991264		Do not support. These don't. The increase in vehicle traffic far exceeds the climate consequences of loss of aviation activity. The flood impacts of replacing large grass areas on an airfield with a network of paved and tarmac surfaces will increase the probability and frequency of surface runoff and thus increase the impact of climate change.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP542	991336		Support.	
DBLP543	991990		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP544	992014		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP545	992366		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP546	992635		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP547	993337		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP548	993387		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
Landscape, Green Infrastructure, Historic and Built Environment: Policies 17-22				
DBLP2	Miss S Gaskell		Supports the policies seeking to conserve and enhance the natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP16	Mr T Bray		Supports the policies seeking to conserve and enhance the natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP24	F Ieromino		Supports the policies seeking to conserve and enhance the natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP31	Clir J Ogle		There weren't any	Policies 17-22 address the built and natural environment.
DBLP32	H Bennett		Supports the policies seeking to conserve and enhance the natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP37		Marine Management Organsation	The East Marine Plan contains a number of policies that are relevant to policies highlighted in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The following east plan policies may be relevant to policies 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 24 within the Draft Bassetlaw Plan: CC1, CC2, SOC2, SOC3, BIO1, BIO2, ECO1, GOV1. Recommend you consult East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System for further information.	To ensure consistency with the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System these documents will be referred to appropriately.
DBLP51	S Tucker	Canal & River Trust	Our towpaths provide public access to the green infrastrucur network which can promote active lifestyles and benefits to wellbeing. Welcome part 2 of the policy which requires major development to demonstrate consideration of how the proposal will integrate with green infrastructure. This could improve public access to our network which could benefit the wellbeing of new communities. Important to recognise that significant new developments in the vicinity of the canal network place extra liabilities and burdens upon the waterway infrastructure as open space and as a sustainable transport route. There are often increased maintenance costs and liabilities such as the removal of litter and maintenance of the towpath. The Trust maintains its towpaths - it is essential that appropriate contributions are secured from developers to mitigate the impact on the network. Promote an expansion to the policy to require development that would likely result in a deterioration or harm to the green infrastructure network to incorporate measures through planning conditions or legal agreements to avoid, mitigate or compensate for the adverse effects likely to result from the development upon the network. Note that Policy 19 includes measures to allow mitigation against impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity this would not include impacts upon the wider green infrastructure network which can best be achieved through expansion of policy 18.	The impact of new development upon open space and/or green infrastructure, particularly relating to maintenance of spaces and the developer contributions that could be secured to help mitigate such adverse impacts are best addressed through Policy 24. Impacts upon green space and future maintenance are referred to in Policy 24 ci.
DBLP37		Marine Management Organsation	The East Marine Plan contains a number of policies that are relevant to policies highlighted in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The following east plan policies may be relevant to policies 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 24 within the Draft Bassetlaw Plan: CC1, CC2, SOC2, SOC3, BIO1, BIO2, ECO1, GOV1. Recommend you consult East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System for further information.	To ensure consistency with the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System these documents will be referred to appropriately.
DBLP37		Marine Management Organsation	The East Marine Plan contains a number of policies that are relevant to policies highlighted in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The following east plan policies may be relevant to policies 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 24 within the Draft Bassetlaw Plan: CC1, CC2, SOC2, SOC3, BIO1, BIO2, ECO1, GOV1. Recommend you consult East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System for further information.	To ensure consistency with the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System these documents will be referred to appropriately.
DBLP51	S Tucker	Canal & River Trust	Welcome para 16.5 that the 18th century Chesterfield Canal and associated structures are considered to play a major part in creating local character and distinctiveness. This inclusion should make policy 21 more effective and make it clear to decision makers that the canal is a heritage asset that should be conserved/enhanced.	Support for Para 16.5 and Policy 21 welcome.
DBLP51	S Tucker	Canal & River Trust	Acknowledge that Policy 22 seeks to promote development quality and sustainability especially in relation to the design and layout of new development. As the Chesterfield Canal forms a key component of the natural and built environment including within the key urban areas of the District recommend the inclusion of a separate policy which addresses issues associated with waterside development especially if the policy wording of policies 9 and 10 are not expanded as proposed e.g. policy SP31 in the Rotherham Sites and Policies Document, June 2018 states that 'subject to satisfying other relevant planning policy, development adjacent to canals will be expected to: a. Be of a high quality design that integrates the canal into the development proposal in a way that treats the waterway as an area of usable space; b integrate the waterway, towing path and canal environment into the public realm in term sof the design and management of the development; c. Improve access to, along and from the waterway and improve the environmental quality of the waterway corridor; d. Optimise views of the water and genereae natural surveillance of water space thorough the siting, configuration and orientation of buildings, recognising that appropriate boundary treatment and access issues may differ between the towing path and offside of the canal; and e. Improve the amenity of the canal. Development that would have an adverse impact on the amenity of the canal by virtue of nosie, odour or visual impact will not be supported.' Inclusion would make the Plan more effective in making decision makers aware of key priorities in promoting positive waterside development.	Policy 22 is a generic policy - whereas the issue of waterside development is specific to Workstop and Retford. This issue would be better addressed in Policies 9 and 10.
DBLP74	S Beard	Sport England	Sport England, in conjunction with Public Health England, has produced 'Active Design' (October 2015), to planning new developments that create the right environment to help people get more active, more often in the interests of health and wellbeing. It sets out ten key principles for ensuring new developments incorporate opportunities for people to take part in sport and physical activity. Active Design contribute to the Government's desire for the planning system to promote healthy communities through good urban design. Sport England would commend its use in master planning for new residential developments. The document can be downloaded via the following link: http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/ A reference to active design could be added to policy 22.	The Local Plan promotes the health and wellbeing of communities. As such Active Design is an important tool for helping to achieve this aim. Reference to Active Design will be added to Policy 22.

DBLP101	J Chatterton	William Davis Ltd	In requesting that new homes meet or exceed the national space standards the Policy is making assumptions against the viability of projects without offering clear evidence or justification of need in the District. Given land and house values in the District are just over half the National average, applying a minimum space and access standard for homes and across housing developments could lead to proposals being unviable, and not in accordance with NPPF para 57.	The Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Assessment considers the impact of the national space standards on viability. An update to the Interim Whole Plan Viability is being undertaken which will re-consider the national space standards against other policy requirements in the Local Plan as well as CIL and developer contributions.
DBLP136	J Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Support the requirement for development proposals to demonstrate how they have regard to landscape character areas and support the inclusion of mitigation measures. Policy 17 should be amended to ensure that it is the mitigation of harm that is required from any development that is required. For the avoidance of doubt, not all characteristics of the landscape will necessarily be positive and it is not necessarily the case that all change will be negative.	It is accepted that not all landscape characteristics are positive. Policy 17 will be amended to better reflect the principles and approach within the Landscape Character Assessment.
DBLP136	J Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Part 1 of the policy is considered to be too vague as to what the proposed trigger for and requirements for open space provision are for development. Those two considerations are vital to understand the effect of the Local Plan on space standards, site design and viability and are essential to the soundness of the Local Plan. This information should be provided and we reserve the right to comment further. The policy should make an allowance for, and provide flexibility to schemes where it is not practical to provide on-site open space.	The Bassetlaw Open Space Assessment is being prepared and will inform the development of this policy. Any cost implications will inform the update to the Whole Plan and CIL Viability Assessment.
DBLP136	J Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	The proposed policy approach should be amended to better reflect the framework for the consideration of heritage assets set out within the NPPF. In its current wording and format the approach reads difficultly when read alongside the NPPF and unnecessarily confuses the policy approach which should properly be applied to the determination of development proposals which may have an effect on the significance of heritage assets.	The heritage policy has been amended in consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer and the responses received.
DBLP136	J Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	Agree with the approach to design in general and consider that it reflects the provisions of the NPPF. The Council's policy objective should be amended to seek to achieve the highest 'practicable' standards of achievable design. The Local Plan notes the clear difficulties that the District has in relation to viability and consider it is necessary to see the design of new housing in the context of all sustainable planning aims including, for example, provision of physical and community infrastructure and affordable homes. Decision makers should be afforded the flexibility to focus on design to the extent that it does not undermine the ability of the Local Plan to achieve those other aims.	The Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Assessment considers the impact of the design policy on viability. An update to the Interim Whole Plan Viability is being undertaken which will re-consider the design policy against other policy requirements in the Local Plan as well as CIL and developer contributions to ensure viable development can be achieved.
DBLP138	L Carter	Bothamsall Parish Council	Supports the policies seeking to conserve and enhance the natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP144	P Eaglen		Support the proposed policies that seek to conserve / enhance the natural and build environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP143	George Breed	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	Bullet Point (h) requires that dwellings meet or exceed the ND55 for new homes. Can only do this in accordance with the framework para 127f & footnote 46 which states a council must justify why internal space standards are required. Do not consider suitable evidence is given to justify this policy position.	The Council will prepare evidence to justify the requirement for the national space standards in new development.
DBLP170	M Malcolm	East Markham Parish Council	Protection of trees and hedges is not given sufficient weight in this policy. In East Markham a number of hedges and trees have disappeared in recent developments. Needs to ensure in future trees and hedgerows are protected by strict conditions at the planning stage and are strictly enforced.	Policy 19 states that development likely to result in the loss, deterioration or harm to habitats or species of importance to biodiversity or geological conservation interests will not be permitted unless...Protected trees and hedgerows are identified by Policy 19 as a habitat or species of importance, as are aged and veteran trees and hedgerows. This is considered to give appropriate weight to the loss or harm of trees and hedgerows.
DBLP170	M Malcolm	East Markham Parish Council	Would prefer that all developments contribute to open space irrespective of size, and that a minimum contribution to open space be per dwelling. Concerned about the loss of green areas over the past years.	National planning policy states that developer contributions are generally only to be sought from major housing developments. It is therefore inappropriate to secure open space from all dwellings. Additionally, it is likely that the cost of securing open space from a single dwelling would adversely affect the viability of development which is contrary to national policy. However CIL contributions which can be secured from most new development could be used to provide for open space as long as it is on the Council's Regulation 123 List.
DBLP170	M Malcolm	East Markham Parish Council	1 (f) encourage rigorous enforcement of this policy particularly ensuring that siting, design, layout and materials are appropriate. This will hopefully prevent the urbanisation of many of our historic villages.	Comments noted.
DBLP170	M Malcolm	East Markham Parish Council	Does not subscribe to the view expressed on Page 123 para 17.3 that the adoption of the residential design SPD has improved the quality of development. Too many oversized properties are still being built on miniscule plots. At the planning stage too little attention is given to the provision of easy movement for walking, cycling and users of public transport.	Comments noted.
DBLP172	J Buckwell	dha planning on behalf of Laing O'Rourke	No objection to the aims and objectives of this policy, in recognition that large industrial buildings may not always be able to achieve every one of the "requirements" suggest that the opening line of part 1 of the policy is amended: "To achieve good quality design, where practicable, development proposals are required to..."	Policy 22 identifies the principles of good design. These should be able to be achieved through the design of all new development. However, if there are reasons why a large industrial building is unable to meet the requirements of Policy 22 this would need to be explained within the Design and Access Statement accompanying a planning application.
DBLP182	D Bramley	Severn Trent Water Ltd	Supportive of Policies 18: and 19: Recognise the importance of nature and natural processes in catchments and the need to ensure that developments do not adversely impact these features. Support the principles behind blue-green corridors, as this recommends the retention of existing watercourses, ditches and land drainage, and located these features in open space. This is vital to delivering a sustainable water system that can support and enable growth and future generations. Effective blue green planning allows both space for water and provides biodiversity benefits, by retaining the existing open watercourses future development has the potential to connect to the natural network avoiding the connection of surface water to manmade systems with limited capacity. As watercourses are often at the low points in a site the corridors can often be utilised to incorporate some SuDS features, either at source or site control level integrating the space for water in the site design, by encouraging green spaces and planting in this area an attractive space that provides additional amenity can also be created and the introduction of footpaths and cycle routes for alternative transport created providing links through the new development for users of the existing settlement and the new development. It is important that these are included as new developments are proposed and planned. Recommend that watercourses as defined by the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 are included in the list in Policy 19 or the inclusion of text in the policy to safeguard existing Land Drainage and Ditches for development to ensure sustainable surface water outfalls are not lost for future growth and that the delivery of the principles behind the drainage hierarchy are taken forward.	Support for policy approach welcome. Watercourses will be added to the list in Policy 19
DBLP183	R Millbank	Environment Agency	Support this section feel it would really benefit from the replacement of all references to "Green Infrastructure" with "Blue Green Infrastructure". This would help highlight the importance of the river, stream, pond and ditch networks as an important habitat and corridor for connecting and supporting wildlife. This recommendation also goes for the rest of the document, wherever Green Infrastructure is currently referenced. This change would really help increase the effectiveness of the supporting text and the Policies in particular. Para 15.9: strongly recommend the addition of the Environment Agency as a key partner for developers to engage with, particularly when looking at the river network. Keen to help advise, plan and also help fund improvement schemes around rivers in particular.	Where appropriate more references to blue-green infrastructure will be added to the Local Plan. However, it may not be practicable to replace all green infrastructure references. The Environment Agency will be added as a partner in paragraph 15.9.
DBLP183	R Millbank	Environment Agency	Recommend the addition of a new bullet point, '5', which states the following: The potential impact of development on any watercourses and ditches must be considered, and where possible enhancements should be included during the construction phase of any proposals.'	To ensure the importance of the river, stream, pond and ditch networks are appropriately protected and recognised as part of the blue-green infrastructure network the potential impact of new development upon watercourses and ditches will be referenced in Policy 18.
DBLP183	R Millbank	Environment Agency	Bullet point 1: more significance should be given to NPPF Section 15, Paragraph 170 which states that net gain should be sought. Strongly recommend rewording to ensure that the Plan is proactively assisting in delivering the aims of the NPPF: '1. New development in the district that leads to a net gain in biodiversity through conserving, creating, restoring or enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity will be supported, subject to other planning policy considerations'. Strongly recommend that bullet point 2c should be altered, with the following text added (set out in italics): 'measures can be provided (secured through planning conditions or legal agreements), that would avoid, mitigate against or, as a last resort, compensate for the adverse effects likely to result from development, provided they also lead to a demonstrable net gain in biodiversity.' Do not see how it could be demonstrated that Policy 19 complies with the NPPF unless these changes, or similar, are incorporated.	Accept that Policy 19 should better reflect the principles of net gain in the NPPF. Policy 19 will be amended accordingly.
DBLP184	M Speck	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Parts of the District are in the 5km buffer zone identified in Natural England's Indicative core area & RSPB's IBA boundary for those parts of Sherwood Forest which meet the primary criterion for designation as an SPA, by virtue of the population of nightjar and woodcock exceeding 1% of the national total. It is essential that the Council pay due attention to potential adverse effects on birds protected under Annex 1 of the Birds' Directive and undertake a "risk-based" assessment of any development, as advised by NE in their guidance note dated March 2014 attached.	The Bassetlaw Habitats Regulations Assessment sets out the screening assessment of the Local Plan upon European sites. It identified that there is potential for likely significant effects upon the Sherwood Forest pSPA. These impacts will require further assessment at the Appropriate Assessment stage to determine whether they would result in adverse effects on the integrity of the site either alone or in-combination. This will be undertaken as part of the development of the next version of the Local Plan, in consultation with Natural England.

DBLP182	D Bramley	Severn Trent Water Ltd	Recognise the importance of public open space and the benefits it can provide for / to communities. Whilst existing and new open space should be protected from inappropriate development, there are opportunities to provide wider benefits to community through flood alleviation projects that could utilise areas of open space to locate blue green infrastructure such as SuDS. Proposed schemes would also need to consider the current site usage / purpose and be designed to enhance as support this function where possible. Whilst any proposal to amend an area of open space would need to be assessed on its individual benefits and issues, the current policy does not adversely hinder flood alleviation projects. Request in policy 20 add: Development proposals for flood alleviation within defined areas of public open space will generally be supported unless a clear detriment to the functionality of the open space is present.	Acknowledge the benefits of multifunctional green infrastructure, including the use of green space for SuDS. However, the principle of creating multifunctional spaces sits better with the policy context of Policy 18, which will be amended accordingly.
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	Welcome the approach that has been set out. Plans should set out the approach to delivering net gains for biodiversity. Net gain for biodiversity should be considered for all aspects of the plan and development types, including transport proposals, housing and community infrastructure.	Accept that Chapter 15 should better reflect the principles of net gain in the NPPF, and will be amended accordingly.
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	Pleased to see a specific policy for green infrastructure, note that green infrastructure has been mentioned in other relevant policies in the draft plan such as biodiversity, design and flood risk. This policy can be further supported with an updated Bassetlaw Green Infrastructure Strategy which will evidence a strategic approach. Green infrastructure refers to the living network of green spaces, water and other environmental features in both urban and rural areas. It is often used in an urban context to provide multiple benefits including space for recreation, access to nature, flood storage and urban cooling to support climate change mitigation, food production, wildlife habitats and health & well-being improvements provided by trees, rights of way, parks, gardens, road verges, allotments, cemeteries, woodlands, rivers and wetlands. Green infrastructure is relevant in a rural context, where it might additionally refer to the use of farmland, woodland, wetlands or other natural features to provide services such as flood protection, carbon storage or water purification.	Elements of the Bassetlaw Green Infrastructure Strategy that are relevant and necessary to inform the Local Plan have/are being updated, such as the Bassetlaw Open Space Assessment and the Bassetlaw Playing Pitch Strategy. At this stage updating the Green Infrastructure Strategy is not considered to be essential to inform the production of the Local Plan.
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	Welcome Policy 19 which sets out an approach to conserve, and where possible restore or enhance, biodiversity and geodiversity in NPPF para 170. Welcomes the list of habitats and species of importance to biodiversity and sites of geological interest, would like to see the Sherwood Forest possible potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA) referenced in this policy: as well as the designated sites advise that the plan considers the impact of the plan's policies on areas of Sherwood Forest that fall in the possible future classification as a Special Protection Area (SPA) for its breeding birds (nightjar and woodlark) interest. Been advised to take a risk based approach to spatial planning and development management, as an SPA classification would trigger the review of any live plans or approved but incomplete projects likely to significantly affect the SPA. Advice note attached. Note the inclusion of the Sherwood Forest ppSPA in the HRA, would like to see the ppSPA included in the Local Plan policies, specifically Policy 19 which refers to habitats and species of importance to biodiversity. The Plan should be underpinned by up to date environmental evidence. This should include an assessment of existing and potential components of local ecological networks. This should inform the Sustainability Appraisal, ensure that land of least environment value is chosen for development, and that the mitigation hierarchy is followed and inform opportunities for enhancement as well as development requirements for particular sites. Priority habitats and species are those listed under S41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, 2006 and UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP). Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs) identify the local action needed to deliver UK targets for habitats and species. They also identify targets for other habitats and species of local importance and can provide a useful blueprint for biodiversity enhancement in any particular area. Protected species are species protected under domestic or European law. Sites containing watercourses, old buildings, significant hedgerows and substantial trees are possible habitats for protected species. Ecological networks are coherent systems of natural habitats organised across whole landscapes so as to maintain ecological functions. A key principle is to maintain connectivity - to enable free movement and dispersal of wildlife e.g. badger routes, river corridors for the migration of fish and staging posts for migratory birds. Local ecological networks will form a key part of the wider Nature Recovery Network proposed in the 25 Year Environment Plan. Where development is proposed, opportunities should be explored to contribute to the enhancement of ecological networks. Planning positively for ecological networks will also contribute towards a strategic approach for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of green infrastructure, as identified in NPPF para 171. Where a plan area contains irreplaceable habitats, such as ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees, there should be appropriate policies to ensure their protection.	Reference to Sherwood Forest ppSPA will be added to Policy 19 to ensure the Local Plan takes a risk based approach to planning. The Bassetlaw Habitats Regulations Assessment sets out the screening assessment of the Local Plan upon European sites. It identified that there is potential for likely significant effects upon the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. These impacts will require further assessment at the Appropriate Assessment stage to determine whether they would result in adverse effects on the integrity of the site either alone or in combination. This will be undertaken as part of the development of the next version of the Local Plan, in consultation with Natural England. The Council will ensure that the Local Plan and the Sustainability Appraisal is underpinned by up to date environmental evidence and that environmental quality is considered robustly through the site selection process.
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	Welcomes this policy. Makes provision for an appropriate quality and quantity for open space, suggest Green Infrastructure could be brought in to enhance this policy. Refer you to the Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance.	Support for Policy 20 welcome. Policy 18 covers the wider issue of green infrastructure, whereas Policy 20 covers open space and sports facilities and the impacts from new development. Policy 20 will be underpinned by the Bassetlaw Open Space Needs Assessment and the Bassetlaw Playing Pitch Strategy which will set out standards and priorities for open space and sports facilities in the District. It is considered that these locally specific assessments better reflect the approach to be taken to open space accessibility than the standards identified in the Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance.
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	Support Policy 22 which aims to enhance the natural environment through design features. Support the addition of other biodiversity enhancing design features such as bird boxes and green or brown roofs.	Green' design is an important feature of new development. The use of biodiversity enhancements could help achieve net gain on site and will be referred to in Policy 22 as a design option to be considered.
DBLP191	K Miller	National Trust	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP191	K Miller	National Trust	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP191	K Miller	National Trust	Care should be taken to ensure that the provisions of the policy in relation to Sites of Special Scientific Interest comply with NPPF paragraph 175.b) and do not provide weaker protection. Concerned that the protection for ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees falls short of the 'wholly exceptional' reasons required by NPPF paragraph 175.c). Suggest that for the avoidance of doubt the word 'and' should be placed between criteria 2a and 2b. Policy 19 goes on to list habitats and species including: - Legally protected species; and - Priority habitats and species listed in the national and local Biodiversity Action Plans. This is now out of date as there is no National Biodiversity Action Plan. The policy should refer to species and habitats of principal importance for conservation as listed in the NERC Act S.41.	It is acknowledged that Policy 19 could better align with NPPF paragraph 175 b and c. Policy 19 will be amended to ensure appropriate protection of these features. Reference to the National Biodiversity Action Plan will be deleted. Species and habitats listed in the NERC Act are protected under national legislation - there is no need to repeat the national legislation in Policy 19. However reference to the Act will be made in the supporting text.
DBLP187	T Swales		Include a defined Pathway for redundant historic buildings to achieve sustainable use. As the accidental owner of a grade 2* redundant church in Ragnall, one of the main challenges and risks to our historic environment is finding a sustainable use for redundant historic buildings, especially older churches. The net effect of the existing and proposed policy as you drive through Darlton and Dunham - unloved churches in a significant state of disrepair, becoming a blight on the community, and the reason is simple. Market forces do not work in finding a use for redundant historic buildings as the system is based on the presumption of "No Change". This is before the unique challenges of our redundant churches, ie They are old buildings requiring significant one-off maintenance spend; They require annual maintenance spend; They are often landlocked, with no access, parking or grounds. The only sustainable use for these churches is residential conversion. Talk about community uses, but there is no money to run the buildings, no parking, have plenty of village halls. What about commercial use? Many businesses fail, especially start-ups, so who would want the odds against success by setting up in a redundant church with higher energy and maintenance costs, no access or parking. Have a defined pathway that leads to a sustainable use, including residential development. The presumption from the outset that commercially viable development will be allowed will encourage developers and landowners to collaborate to create these viable schemes, including access and parking. Enabling developments could be considered for the really problematic buildings. If we do not specifically develop a solution for old churches, then who knows what condition Darlton, Dunham and the other redundant churches and buildings will be in 20 years time.	Comments noted.
DBLP191	K Miller	National Trust	Suggest that the list of major contributors to the character and distinctiveness of Bassetlaw ought to include 'the wooded and more open landscapes of Sherwood Forest' as this is a landscape character area with a strong historic dimension.	Comments noted.
DBLP191	K Miller	National Trust	Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP192	B Lomas	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	Flexibility needs to be included in this policy. Concerned with part 'h' which requires nationally described space standards to be met or exceeded. Query the justification for this and note the detailed comments made by the HBF in this regard. No evidence has been provided by the Council to demonstrate a need for or the viability impact of including the standards in a local plan policy.	The Council will prepare evidence to justify the requirement for the national space standards in new development.
DBLP208	S Weston	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	Do not support. It is never enough. I believe that we add this bit because we have to and we really want to believe it will be done. Then when the costs become clear the minimum is all that gets done.	Comments noted.
DBLP217	S Hayle	Axis ped on behalf of FCC Environment	Support this policy as it acknowledges that the need for, and benefits of the development can outweigh the adverse effect in relation to biodiversity providing appropriate mitigation can be provided. This is in accordance with the NPPF Paragraph 170 that planning policies should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan).	Support for Policy 19 welcome and noted.
DBLP219	C Jesson	Planning and Design Group on behalf of the Welbeck Estates Company Ltd	Bassetlaw has a rich history, and, has a diverse range of heritage assets. Welbeck forms part of this rich tapestry and accounts for a number of heritage assets and traditional buildings, this has been recognised in the Plan. As such Welbeck supports the aim to conserve such assets, it should be acknowledged that such buildings, particularly if they are vacant, that to secure their future a range of alternative uses, or bringing them back into use should be considered. Need to take a proactive approach to safeguarding heritage assets and that may be through innovative uses or adaptation. The proposed policy is worded so that it is against development in the first instance, rather than encouraging creative, high quality and innovative development which would conserve and safeguard assets of heritage value which are key to the District's rich historic past. Any future policy should seek to encourage the re-use of underused or vacant buildings and the safeguarding of these buildings should not be unnecessarily burdened to promote creative and innovative development. This would help give greater certainty that assets can be safeguarded, in more instances their condition improved, and their value and function within the landscape and the community increased.	Comments noted.

DBLP219	C Jesson	Planning and Design Group on behalf of the Welbeck Estates Company Ltd	Agree there is a need to for the emerging Plan to enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure in the District, as it plays a key role in planning for community health and well-being. The Plan needs to assess existing green infrastructure for genuine biodiversity or geotechnical value. Consideration should be given to ensure existing sites of green space, which are of low biodiversity or geodiversity value or interest, are not protected purely on the basis it may conserve biodiversity or geodiversity. Sites have to be assessed on their merits and will be unique to one another; a District wide approach that categorises certain green spaces in the current way needs to be more responsive to this. Such an action could impact upon the objective to ensure that the District's housing needs are met. Suggest this information is translated into an update of Bassetlaw's Landscape Character Assessment (LCA), now 10 years old. Suggest at least a review of boundaries, to ensure that they are still relevant and not overly restrictive.	The Bassetlaw Open Space Needs Assessment takes a pragmatic approach to protecting and enhancing open space in the District based on quantity, quality, and value of spaces. This ensures that spaces are not protected just for their own sake. However, it is important to acknowledge that because a space is no longer considered to have value for a particular open space function that it could accommodate an alternative open space function. This is a different issue to that evidenced by the Landscape Character Assessment which is considered to remain appropriate to inform the development of the Local Plan.
DBLP217	S Hayle	Axis ped on behalf of FCC Environment	Support as it acknowledges that the Council will support development of a good quality design which positively contributes to the appearance of the area. The Policy sets out a list of criteria which development proposals are required to adhere to in order to achieve good quality design. The development of FCC's site at Carlton Forest will be well designed in order to respond to the semi-rural character of the area.	Support for Policy 22 noted and welcome.
DBLP221	B Weedall	Gladman Developments	Support many of the principles concerned with the requirement that all dwellings must meet or exceed the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). Refer to the Written Ministerial Statement 25th March 2015 which confirms that: "the optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the NPPG". With particular reference to the NDSS the PPG confirms "where a need for internal space standards is identified, local planning authorities should provide justification for requiring internal space policies". If the Council wishes to adopt this standard it should be justified by meeting the criteria set out in the PPG including need, viability and impact on affordability. Similarly, to the accessibility standards, if it had been the Government's intention that all properties were built to these standards then the standards would have been made mandatory. Concerns relates to the additional cost and the implications on affordability. If a housebuilder builds a standard 2-bedroom unit at 72sqm the national space standards require dwellings to have certain dimensions which means that they can only be built at a minimum of 79sqm, this can add significantly to the cost of the property and in turn increase the cost of an entry level 2-bedroom house, exacerbating the affordability issues in the area not addressing the housing needs.	The Council will prepare evidence to justify the requirement for the national space standards in new development and will ensure that any proposed standards are considered through the updated Whole Plan Viability Assessment.
DBLP229	S Ashton		Supports the policies seeking to conserve and enhance the natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP245	P Bland		In addition to s106 agreements for housing developments developers should make adequate provision for allotments to encourage residents to be self sufficient and to encourage environmental use of the local area.	Where a development is expected to have an adverse impact on allotment provision provision of space for allotments can be sought as part of new development.
DBLP259	R Worrall	Historic England	Support the approach to the historic environment in draft Policy 21. The preceding text in Chapter 16 is welcomed and sets out elements contributing to the local distinctiveness of the area and key contributors to the historic environment. It is considered that buried archaeology could be made more apparent in order to meet the requirements of the NPPF.	Buried archaeology will be better incorporated in Policy 21 to ensure consistency with the NPPF.
DBLP255	S Green	Home Builders Federation	Policy 22 (h) requires that dwellings meet or exceed the NDSS for new homes. If the Council wishes to adopt the optional NDSS then this should only be done in accordance with the 2019 NPPF (para 127f & Footnote 46). Footnote 46 states that policies may make use of the NDSS where the need for an internal space standard can be justified. Should gather evidence to determine whether there is a need for additional standards in their area and justify setting appropriate policies. The NPPG sets out that "Where a need for internal space standards is identified, LPAs should provide justification for requiring internal space policies. LPA should take account of the following areas need, viability and timing" (ID: 56-020). This should be considered before introducing the NDSS. It is incumbent on the Council to provide a local assessment evidencing the need for NDSS. If it had been the Government's intention that generic statements justified adoption of the NDSS then the standards would be mandatory via the Building Regulations which the Government has not done. The NDSS should be introduced on a "need to have" rather than a "nice to have" basis. The identification of a need for the NDSS must be more than in some cases the standard has not been met - it should identify the harm caused or may be caused in the future and identify if there is a systemic problem to resolve. The impact on viability should be assessed to test the cumulative impact of policy burdens. The Council's viability assessment is incorrect by only testing an averaged NDSS rather than the actual NDSS. If the Council introduces the NDSS as a policy requirement this involves minimum dimensions for bedroom sizes so it is inappropriate to use an average rather than the actual NDSS as an averaged sized unit may not comply with minimum bedroom sizes. There is a direct relationship between unit size, cost per square metre, selling price per metre and affordability. The Council cannot expect home buyers to absorb extra costs in a District where affordability pressures exist as evidenced by a worsening affordability ratio. The Council should assess potential impact on meeting demand for starter homes and first-time buyers as the impacts are significant on 2 and 3 bed dwellings. Where NDSS is to be adopted the impact on affordability should be assessed. At the same time as pushing additional families into affordable housing need because they can no longer afford to buy a NDSS compliant home, delivery of affordable housing may be undermined. The Council has provided no evidence of considering these impacts. The requirement for NDSS reduces the number of units per site - the amount of land needed to achieve the same number of units must be increased. The efficient use of land is less because development densities have been decreased. At the same time the infrastructure and regulatory burden falls on fewer units per site which intensifies the challenge of meeting residual / existing use plus land values which determines if land is released for development by a willing landowner especially in lower value areas and on brownfield sites. Should take into consideration any adverse effects on delivery rates of sites in the housing trajectory. The delivery rates will be predicated on market affordability at relevant price points of units and maximising absorption rates. An adverse impact on the affordability of starter home / first time buyer products may translate into reduced or slower delivery rates. The Council should put forward transitional arrangements. The land deals underpinning identified allocated sites will have been secured prior the introduction of NDSS. These sites should be allowed to proceed before any policy requirements are enforced. The NDSS should not be applied to any outline or detailed approval prior to the specified date and any reserved matters applications should not be subject to NDSS. This policy requirement should be modified before publication of the pre-submission Local Plan consultation.	The Council will prepare evidence to justify the requirement for the national space standards in new development and will ensure that any proposed standards are considered through the updated Whole Plan Viability Assessment.
DBLP270	D Troop		The preamble to Policy 17, particularly 14.1 and 14.2, is weak. Appreciate the human history significantly more than the landscape. The District is largely flat with Power Stations and their pylon power-lines meaning that many people travel to nearby Peak District, Lincolnshire Wolds or Yorkshire Dales for outdoor leisure. 14.1 is a prescriptive statement that cannot be evidenced and indeed, 14.2 confirms that Bassetlaw is without landscape designations. 14.2 puts forward that the highly valued landscapes make for "a very desirable location" but this is not born out by property prices or land values (which are low) and the Idle Valley Nature Reserve has taken to local press in a bid to generate more visitors. The phrase: "These circumstances generate significant pressure on the countryside to meet a range of demands and the Bassetlaw Plan therefore has an important role to play in ensuring that new development does not undermine these fundamental assets of the district" is pure spin and part of the strategy to limit allocations in rural settlements in favour of urban areas and the proposed 2 x garden villages. Indeed, it is only through excessive limitation of allocations/growth in Rural Service Centres, that the draft plan can conjure up the numbers required to make garden villages viable. The value of the Bassetlaw landscape is overstated added to which the Landscape Character Assessment for Everton contains misleading photographs (taken from outside the policy zone in Wiseton and showing the "back" of Pusto Hill, with Mattersey Priory in the foreground (7) – and no evidence of Everton village). Just as misleading is the absence of reference to Everton carr-land, despite this "landscape" is far more prevalent in the Parish. Dated 2009, the Landscape Character Assessment is also written well before Brexit negotiations and the advent of growing veganism. Seeking to influence landscape policy so that farmers revert to grazing in order to conserve the landscape is not reasonable – particularly since the biggest farmer losers in Brexit are livestock producers. The LPA is using an outdated evidence-base. Policy 17.2 is a pejorative statement that cannot be defined/implemented fairly. Objected to allocations in the Everton Neighbourhood Plan that are situated on higher topography, in conservation areas and in more visible locations than our own site and yet it is our site that has been excluded.	The supporting text to Policy 17 is designed to introduce the policy topic and provide context for that policy. It is acknowledged that the statements in paragraphs 14.1 and 14.2 could be strengthened by use of quotes for the Local Plan evidence base. The Landscape Character Assessment is considered to remain appropriate to inform the development of the Local Plan. The Everton Neighbourhood Plan is produced by the Neighbourhood Plan Group on behalf of the community and not the Council. The allocations identified are therefore selected and evidenced by the Group and consulted upon with the wider community before a decision is made. The Council has no influence over the site allocations in a Neighbourhood Plan.
DBLP270	D Troop		Submitted riverbank land to the Call for Sites as a precursor to Marina delivery in Everton/the district. The land is opposite the village of Misson in the location of the historic ferry. Notts Wildlife Trust has identified the Idle Valley in Bassetlaw as important wildlife habitat – despite already retaining control of the Idle Valley Nature Reserve and despite the Idle Valley representing a location of nationally significant human history (Pilgrim Fathers/mothers escape and the precursor to the Chesterfield Canal). Do not feel confident that the wording of Policy 19 will assist us in the delivery of the Idle Valley Marina. 19.2b will be employed to deliver the Marina in a less historically accurate location: i: Because Notts Wildlife Trust will overstate the biodiversity credentials of the location ii: Because we are in the north of the district and leisure development here benefits Doncaster more than wider Bassetlaw	Local Wildlife Sites are designated according to nationally established criteria. The Local Wildlife Sites Review has recently been completed and the final sites will form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan. The NPPF requires that the Local Plan identify, map and safeguard local wildlife rich habitats and ecological networks including international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them. Policy 19, interprets this aspect of national policy at a local level. Without it the Local Plan would not be sound.
DBLP270	D Troop		The current open space policy will not be improved by the wording in policy 20 which is too vague. Residential sites delivered in rural areas will often be surrounded by open countryside, footpaths, by-ways, bridleways or indeed as in the case of Everton, by 7000 acres of carr land offering public access. Ornamental gardens et al are not needed in a rural location where households have easy/extensive access to the countryside and indeed their own private gardens. On occasion, there may be a need for pocket parks for small children. Policy 20 needs to reflect the urban/rural split.	It is accepted that Policy 20 and its supporting text should include a definition of open space. In this context open space does not include countryside or ornamental gardens. Instead it includes parks, amenity greenspace, natural and semi natural greenspace, space for children and young people, allotments, cemeteries and civic spaces as defined by the Bassetlaw Open Space Needs Assessment.
DBLP267	D Backhouse	Sustrans Bassetlaw Rangers	Strongly support Policy 22 – Design, paragraph 1 e: transport user hierarchy (although paragraph i: cycle parking facilities, needs development of minimum standards, which are currently inadequate, especially for high-density residential locations).	Support for Policy 22 1e is noted and welcome.
DBLP271	Anonymous		Supported. Will it include a children's play area and maybe a skate park. 7 - 11 year olds are sometimes forgotten when things are being built.	New open space is designed to meet the needs of new development. So it could include space for children and young people.

DBLP270	D Troop		OBJECTION is made to the terms "URBAN GRAIN" and "BUILDING LINES". Those terms are proxy for having to conform to "ribbon development". Meaning that the LPA is then able to employ the term "backland development" as a negative descriptor – even where the scheme backs onto open countryside. Site Assessments for the Everton Neighbourhood Plan, Rural Solutions Hearing submission where those site assessments are questioned, Health Assessment for the Everton Neighbourhood Plan where Rosemary Kidd questioned the use of the term "ribbon development", Hearing of the Everton Neighbourhood Plan where the Examiner questioned the use of the term "backland development" and exhorted the Parish Council to allocate our site NB: we have a transcript of the Hearing. Instead – the Bassetlaw LP and specifically this policy, should be aiming for efficient land use and "COMPACTION" as befitting of the SHMA desire for smaller properties. Where the new site is adjacent to large properties, massing requirements can be fulfilled via semi-detached or terraced properties. Unlike neighbouring authorities, Bassetlaw has never employed an Urban Designer. This means that the dept. is without a consistent approach to urban design and different design expectations depend upon the Case Officer. Invest in an urban designer so that Policy 22 can be delivered in a fair and equitable way. Had to submit 4 layouts to preapp 18/00035 (2/3/18) because the case officer could not tell us what he wanted (other than DIDN'T like the layout submitted at outline).	Policy 1a aims to ensure that the design of new development reflects the character of its locality. Backland development and efficient use of land will be considered through new policies contained within the next version of the Local Plan. The Everton Neighbourhood Plan is produced by the Neighbourhood Plan Group on behalf of the community and not the Council. The allocations identified are therefore selected and evidenced by the Group and consulted upon with the wider community before a decision is made. The Council has no influence over the site allocations in a Neighbourhood Plan.
DBLP281	B Lange	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome Policy 17 especially "4. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to the landscape, the prior condition of the landscape will be taken into account in the consideration of development proposals."	Support for Policy 17 noted and welcome.
DBLP281	B Lange	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome the explicit inclusion of non-designated heritage assets and the fact that the policy also applies to them	Support for Policy 21 noted and welcome.
DBLP284	N Ward	Doncaster Council	Would fully support Policy 21 which is in keeping with the significance led approach of the NPPF and particularly the requirement in part 2 that proposals affecting heritage assets or their setting be informed by a proportionate heritage statement. The requirement in part 1(i) for 'Ensuring that historic shopfronts are conserved or enhanced and new shopfronts in the historic environment are appropriately designed' seems a little incongruous and less 'strategic' in relation to the other requirements.	Support for Policy 21 noted and welcome. The approach taken to the design of shopfronts in the historic environment is a planning issue of importance and one which requires detailing in this policy.
DBLP281	B Lange	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome the policy but there is a possible conflict between the transport user hierarchy and the ease of delivering public transport services. Winding streets are considered attractive for non-motorized traffic by some but make it difficult operationally and financially to deliver bus services (long journey times, the requirement to use more vehicles than straighter routes etc). The best option is to ensure permeability and legibility throughout as this helps those walking, public transport users and bus operators.	Policy 22 1e will be reworded to promote an inclusive, permeable and interconnected transport network attractive to all users.
DBLP284	N Ward	Doncaster Council	Support the inclusion of the requirement for new dwellings to meet or exceed the optional Nationally Described Space Standards and feel the policy is appropriate to improve the quality of new homes within the region. For the policy to be compliant with the NPPG (NPPG para 020 Ref ID 56-020-20150327) a robust evidence base will need to be prepared in advance of the submission of the Local Plan.	The Council will prepare evidence to justify the requirement for the national space standards in new development and will ensure that any proposed standards are considered through the updated Whole Plan Viability Assessment.
DBLP296			Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP301	977042		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP303	978627		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP304	986292		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP308	986480		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP314	987642		No support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. These will be destroyed by the garden villages.	Should the garden villages proceed it is acknowledged that careful masterplanning will be required to ensure the built and natural environment is appropriately protected and enhanced.
DBLP315	987680		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. The airfield at Gamston provides a secure environmental habitat for many animals and birds, the grounds are well maintained and provide an environment which is protected from hunting or illegal poaching activity. The airfield itself is of historic interest, a site used for training RAF bomber crews during the war, one of the few remaining sites that are still being used as intended.	Should the garden villages proceed it is acknowledged that careful masterplanning will be required to ensure the built and natural environment is appropriately protected and enhanced.
DBLP317	987880		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP318	987892		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP319	987959		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP321	988036		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP323	988047		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP326	988057		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP328	988061		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP336	988172		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. But not to flatten buildings to build more buildings and the existing buildings are environmentally good as they are	The Local Plan does promote the re-use of land and buildings as part of sustainable development. However, in some cases it is just not possible to do so. It is not always the case that existing buildings are as environmentally efficient as new buildings.
DBLP339	988184		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP343	988216		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP344	988235		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP345	988237		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP349	988325		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP350	988344		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP351	988346		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Have discussions taken place with Notts CC to enable their Mineral Plan and the Bassetlaw District Council local plan not to contradict each other, as in some cases they are vying for the same parcel of lands.	Nottinghamshire County Council are a statutory consultee for the Local Plan. Their comments will be taken into account in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP357	Scrooby		Are wholeheartedly supported.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood		Conservation and enhancement of the Historic Environment. Residing and working in a historic location with significant international effect, Policy 21 is vital and must be mandatory.	Policy 21 would apply to all of the District's heritage assets.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Support for conservation and enhancement of built and natural environment policies. But will have an effect on the deliverability of the housing requirement.	There may be exceptional circumstances where the conservation and enhancement of the natural and built environment adversely impacts on the viability of a housing site. However, the Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that the housing requirement for the District can be achieved as part of a viable plan.
DBLP363	988482		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP364	988487		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP371	988500		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP372	988501		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP373	988503		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP375	988527		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP376	988557		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP379	988630		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP384	988726		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP386	988747		Support for conservation and enhancement of built and natural environment policies. I don't think Bassetlaw go far enough in protecting the natural environment eg they allow developers to rip out hawthorn hedging and natural wildlife habitats and do nothing to stop developers doing this when they do so without consent. they also allow large areas of non grass areas for gardens again something which means nature can no longer thrive.	Where the Council is aware of a developer contravening a planning permission and/or other relevant legislation, enforcement action will be taken. Planning permission is not needed if a new or replacement driveway of any size in a front garden uses permeable (or porous) surfacing which allows water to drain through, such as gravel, permeable concrete block paving or porous asphalt, or if the rainwater is directed to a lawn or border to drain naturally. If the surface to be covered is more than five square metres planning permission will be needed for laying traditional, impermeable driveways that do not provide for the water to run to a permeable area. Planning consent is not required for such works in rear gardens.
DBLP387	988748		Support. Only if existing businesses are not affected adversely.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.

DBLP391	988813		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP392	988889		No support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. They appear to directly contravene other proposed policies.	The Local Plan is intended to be used holistically and the developer will need to ensure that all relevant aspects are addressed in a planning application so that a balanced assessment of the proposal can be made.
DBLP393	989007		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP394	989023		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP398	989658		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP399	989741		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP402	990030		No support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP403	990043		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. Bassetlaw is a beautiful area, but must develop or be left behind.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP404	990059		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. Bassetlaw is a beautiful area, but must develop or be left behind.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP405	990062		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. I do not think that it is easy to answer this. Good design can be very subjective and different in outcome whilst still meeting the requirements of the policy - would it all be permitted? I would like to see modern construction methods, new materials and non-traditional design should be considered - especially in areas where there is no characteristic style in the locality - but it never seems to happen in Bassetlaw. Be more forward thinking and looking and move away from the standard design we see everywhere	For a proposal to be acceptable in terms of design, in future it would need to comply with the criteria in Policy 22. Policy 22 1k promotes innovative buildings and modern construction standards.
DBLP407	990068		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP408	990070		Don't support conservation and enhancement of built and natural environment policies. We have a growing population of birds of prey, deer etc in the area, extra cars become a danger to them	Comments noted.
DBLP410	990076		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP411	990079		Don't support built and natural environment conservation and enhancement policies. No because the proposals will not enhance the environment as there are too few parameters and restrictions in place thereby giving developers Carte Blanche.	The policies are designed to operate within the parameters of international and national legislation and national planning guidance so the plan is as restrictive as it is able to be. However, it is not accepted that the Local Plan gives developers freedom to develop without restrictions.
DBLP416	990240		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment. Another one that does not need much thinking about. All Authorities and Individuals should be concerned and be taking action to 'conserve and enhance the natural and built environment". However, with this in mind why are the Plans determined to take a large expanse of Agricultural Land, bordered by an existing Commercial Area, for housing ?? This latter part provides highly technical employment, which should be encouraged further to give more of this type of work in the Bassetlaw/Retford district.	Where possible the Local Plan makes best use of brownfield sites and buildings for new development. However, it is not possible to meet the housing requirement for the District only on brownfield land, some greenfield land will be required. A housing land availability assessment is being undertaken to inform the site allocations in the next version of the Local Plan. One consideration is the loss of high quality agricultural land and the loss of employment land.
DBLP418	990387		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.. It is important that the character of our villages and towns is maintained and that development fits in with the existing character of these places. There is a danger that our villages could become simply "suburbs" of nearby cities	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP419	990400		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP420	990465		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP421	990489		Support for policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP422	990506		Don't support policies which seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP423	990541		Which policies seek to conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.?	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP424	990549		Don't support. Conserving and preserving the airfield should be important too - they offer a habitat which has been in use by ground living animals for decades and its loss will adversely affect them.	Thank you for your comments which are noted. Nature conservation is taken into consideration in planning decisions on development. Any adverse affects would need to be addressed where necessary.
DBLP425	990570		Don't support	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP426	990571		Don't support	Comments noted.
DBLP427	990577		Support	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP428	990594		Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP429	990613		Support	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP430	990614		Don't support. The use of climate change as an argument is merely a way to help spin the closing of the airport.	Mitigating climate change relates to maximising energy efficiency, renewable energy, flood risk, water efficiency and making better use of resources, rather than air travel.
DBLP431	990633		Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP434	990659		Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP435	990666		Support	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP436	990682		Support. However your proposals are incompatible with these aims.	Comments noted.
DBLP437	990704		Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP438	990717		Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP439	990719		Don't support. I am lost for words on this one. building does not address climate change. Planting trees and encouraging wildlife. Farming etc all helps address this not thrown up concrete housing with tarmac driveways.	In the Local Plan mitigating climate change relates to maximising energy efficiency, renewable energy, flood risk, water efficiency and making better use of resources rather than relating to building new development.
DBLP440	990764		Don't support	Comments noted.
DBLP441	990783		Don't support	Comments noted.
DBLP442	990799		Don't support	Comments noted.
DBLP443	990800		No support for climate change policies.	Comments noted.
DBLP444	990802		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP445	990806		Do not support	Comments noted.
DBLP447	990818		Do not support	Comments noted.
DBLP448	990826		Support. Any policies that seek to improve the environment are welcome.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP449	990829		Do not support	Comments noted.
DBLP451	990837		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP453	990842		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP454	990843		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP455	990845		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP456	990846		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP457	990847		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP458	990848		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP459	990849		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP460	990850		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP461	990852		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP463	990855		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP464	990856		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP465	990859		Support. Building hundreds of houses so close to a major road A1 will only add to the problems.	Comments noted.
DBLP466	990862		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP467	990865		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP468	990869		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP469	990882		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP470	990884		Do not support.	Comments noted.

DBLP471	990885		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP472	990886		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP473	990889		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP474	990891		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP475	990893		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP476	990895		Support	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP477	990901		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP478	990904		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP479	990910		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP480	990912		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP481	990913		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP482	990914		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP483	990915		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP484	990916		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP485	990917		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP486	990918		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP487	990919		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP488	990921		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP489	990922		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP490	990926		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP491	990928		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP492	990930		Do not support. Destroying the airfield will take significant energy and a natural habit, not over farmed. Building on greenfield would use less energy.	Comments noted.
DBLP493	990933		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP494	990934		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP495	990936		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP496	990937		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP497	990938		Do not support. Again, not seen any information regarding this.	Comments noted.
DBLP498	990940		Support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP499	990942		Do not support. An airfield is one of the best ways of preserving small to medium animals and birds, grasses, mosses and lichens.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP500	990943		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP501	990944		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP502	990946		Do not support.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP503	M Turner		Do not support. The draft plan aims to protect the environment by destroying vital infrastructure rather than make it complementary and additive to the region?	Thank you for your comments which are noted.
DBLP504	990949		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP505	C Taylor		Support. Any proposal to improve the environment is welcome. It should not have to be dependent on 2 new villages being built .	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP506	990952		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP507	990954		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP508	990955		Do not support. While I support endeavours to protect the environment at large, the building of major housing developments does in no way protect our surroundings unless worded very cleverly with twisted statistics. I do not believe any of the promises in the basetlaw draft plan as there are already factual contradictions evident. The entire document I'd fawed.	Comments noted.
DBLP509	990959		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP510	990961		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP511	990962		Support. The former Lound Hall colliery site should be used and the airport left in its entirety.	Comments noted.
DBLP512	990964		Do not support. Gamston Airport should be retained as an established active airport as part of the national transport infrastructure. Amongst aviation businesses and services, the airport supports the air ambulance and air ambulances are becoming an increasingly important part of the National Health Service infrastructure as more areas suffer from increasing road traffic congestion.	Should the garden villages proceed it is acknowledged that careful masterplanning will be required to ensure the built and natural environment is appropriately protected and enhanced.
DBLP513	990965		Support	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP514	990980		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP515	991045		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP516	991153		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP517	991157		Support. Yes that is why I am against the site especially at Gamston /Eaton which needs to be conserved as the villages and surrounding farm land already help and maintain the natural habitat of a multitude of birds and wildlife. Which would be vastly depleted with these two new village's.	Should the garden villages proceed it is acknowledged that careful masterplanning will be required to ensure the built and natural environment is appropriately protected and enhanced.
DBLP518	991172		Do not support. Although all the other policies in the plan are destroying the rural environment we live in.	Comments noted.
DBLP519	991173		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP520	991174		Do not support. All the other policies in the plan are destroying the rural environment we live in, so I think this needs to be stronger, and the other policies need to work with the plan as well, it can't be just a stand alone policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP521	991176		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP522	991178		Do not support. As a result in the proposed development there will be a negative effect on the natural environment , with development comes a lot of new people who will wander and disturb the surrounding habitat which will reduce species numbers ,(an undisturbed pheasant for example although laying 12 eggs will only rear 2-3 chicks this number will reduce with increased human traffic)	Should the garden villages proceed it is acknowledged that careful masterplanning will be required to ensure the built and natural environment is appropriately protected and enhanced.
DBLP523	991181		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP524	991184		Do not support. How can your proposed policies possibly "conserve and enhance the natural and built environment" when you plan to bulldoze Retford Gamston Airport that has been there since 1942 and been evolving into its present form as a general aviation hub since 1993 under the present ownership? The airport was invited to represent Bassetlaw by the council and John Mann MP in parliament for "Bassetlaw Day" on 6 September 2016 and after being voted General Aviation Airport of the year in 2015 by the Airport Operators Association.... so what has so dramatically changed in a little over 3 years that sees the council moving from using it to help showcase the area to now wishing to see it closed? https://twitter.com/johnmannmp/status/773106970941353984	Should the garden villages proceed it is acknowledged that careful masterplanning will be required to ensure the built and natural environment is appropriately protected and enhanced.
DBLP525	991186		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP526	991188		Do not support. I have no comment on this.	Comments noted.
DBLP527	991190		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP528	991208		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP529	991209		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP530	991219		Do not support. Attempting to conserve and enhance the already natural habitat would be to not build in the first place. Whatever you attempt in aid of protecting it won't help, you will be disturbing all the wildlife already here, which may not come back once building is complete. The noise and traffic alone will disturb all the wildlife and not to mention their homes.	Should the garden villages proceed it is acknowledged that careful masterplanning will be required to ensure the built and natural environment is appropriately protected and enhanced.
DBLP531	991221		Do not support. why destroy Gamston Aerodrome as it is at present. the Farming, Aerodrome and wildlife live in harmony.	Comments noted.
DBLP532	Gareth Evans		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP533	991230		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP534	991231		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP535	991234		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP536	991235		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP537	991237		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP538	991240		Support. Although looking at all the existing developments that have occurred recently in Bassetlaw I do not believe this will happen.... there are no existing developments which retain the planned natural environment. You only have to drive around the Gateford developments in Worksop to see the total lack of green space to 'enhance the natural environment'.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP539	991241		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP540	991243		Do not support. See above.	Comments noted.

DBLP541	991264		Do not support. There is no question that airfields provide extensive natural environments that will not be adequately compensated by an increase in human activity, an increase in non native garden species of plants, extensive tarmac and paved surfaces.	Comments noted.
DBLP512	990964		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP542	991336		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP543	991990		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP544	992014		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP545	992366		Support.	Support for policies 17-22 noted and welcome.
DBLP546	992635		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP547	993337		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP548	993387		Do not support.	Comments noted.
Infrastructure Delivery and Community Facilities: Policies 23-24				
DBLP2	Miss S Gaskell		Supports the policies to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	Support for policies 23-24 noted and welcome.
DBLP16	Mr T Bray		Supports the policies to deliver and safeguard infrastructure - provided that we don't lose too much of our green and pleasant land.	Support for policies 23-24 noted and welcome.
DBLP24	F Ieromino		Supports the policies to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	Support for policies 23-24 noted and welcome.
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		Not Bassetlaw's remit	Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council is required to engage a range of key stakeholders and infrastructure providers on the development of the Local Plan. Although much infrastructure is not provided by the Council, the infrastructure providers are expected to positively engage to help ensure that the Local Plan is deliverable. Statements of Common Ground will be used to ensure infrastructure is delivered.
DBLP32	H Bennett		Supports the policies to deliver and safeguard infrastructure - not sure that the policies adequately deliver the above.	Support for policies 23-24 noted and welcome.
DBLP74	S Beard	Sport England	Sport England is concerned that proposals involve the development of new community and leisure and sports facilities without appropriate evidence. This is covered in Policy 23 - how will this demand from and for new development be calculated? Para 92 of NPPF promotes positive planning - it is noted that your authority does not have an up to date evidence base with respect to built sports facilities how will policy 23 be understood what is needed? What facilities need improvement what should be replaced and where? Sport England would expect that the emerging Playing Pitch Strategy (which we support) would be the key evidence base to understand the priority of each playing field site, the assessment has been carried out to provide evidence in accordance with para 96 of NPPF. Which sites are important and should be protected? which need enhancement? Policy 23 is about new development, a reference to the Playing Pitch Strategy in guiding this development with regard to sports pitches should be made. This policy is confusing as sports pitches are also referenced in policy 20 open space which policy takes primacy?. Both policies imply that sports pitches can be relocated and replaced. The pitches may be identified in the PPS as being in the right place, there other elements to para 97 NPPF regarding alternative sports facilities on sports pitches is this covered? A reference to active design could be added to policy 23	The Council's emerging Playing Pitch Strategy and Retail and Leisure Study will provide the evidence for the Local Plan, including the type of facilities required and when, and which facilities should be protected. Chapter 15 will provide the primary policy framework for playing fields and sports facilities with additional complementary references made throughout the document. Further detail will be added to the next version of the Local Plan to reflect the emerging evidence base. Reference to active design will be added to Policy 23
DBLP37		Marine Management Organisation	The East Marine Plan contains a number of policies that are relevant to policies highlighted in the Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The following east plan policies may be relevant to policies 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 24 within the Draft Bassetlaw Plan: CC1, CC2, SOC2, SOC3, BIO1, BIO2, ECO1, GOV1. Recommend you consult East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans and Marine Information System for further information.	All relevant planning documents will be considered and referred to, where appropriate, in the Local Plan including the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans - these will form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.
DBLP51	S Tucker	Canal & River Trust	Significant new developments in the vicinity of the canal network place extra liabilities and burdens upon the waterway infrastructure and it is essential that appropriate contributions are secured from developers where necessary to mitigate the impact of new development on the Trust's assets. Welcome 19.7 that developer contributions will be required to ensure that any adverse impacts on local services is appropriately mitigated. Important to note that infrastructure included on an adopted Regulation 123 list through CIL cannot be funded through s106 agreements. Note Policy 24 includes aspirations to include CIL contributions towards physical and green infrastructure. Concerned that waterway infrastructure could be subsumed into these broad categories. There is a risk that if a development is likely to have an adverse impact on the canal network off site mitigation may no longer be possible via the s106 route as an argument could be made that such improvements should be achieved via CIL. Likewise because the categories of green infrastructure and transport are broad mitigation might not be achieved via this route either. To prevent this risk the policy should be expanded to state that off site provisions necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms for the provision of green infrastructure and transport scheme should be achieved via the use of developer contributions under s106/s278. This will make the policy more effective and ensure that para 19.7 can be fully met.	It is accepted that developer contributions cannot be used to provide for infrastructure identified on the Regulation 123 list. However, this depends on the way the infrastructure on the Regulation 123 list is defined. Therefore it is inappropriate to restrict provision of green infrastructure and transport via s106/s278 agreements. It is possible that developer contributions can be used to help mitigate impacts of development on waterway infrastructure, even if CIL is used for some elements of green infrastructure.
DBLP71	Wood plc	Wood plc on behalf of the National Grid	National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning our networks. To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure.	The Council will ensure that the National Grid will continue to be involved in the site selection process.
DBLP74	S Beard	Sport England	As a general observation should it be clear what facilities will be covered by CIL and what would be covered under planning obligations?	The Council's Regulation 123 list provides details of the current infrastructure schemes that CIL will be used for. But as the Regulation 123 list can be updated more frequently than the Local Plan it would be inappropriate to identify the content of the list in Policy 24. However, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will provide more detail on the which infrastructure projects will be provided by developer contributions and those where CIL will be involved.
DBLP91	S Freek	Highways England	Considering the wider development proposals outside of the Plan area, high levels of cumulative growth are coming forward across Bassetlaw and adjacent local authority areas. A Statement of Common Ground has been prepared between Chesterfield, North East Derbyshire, Bolsover and Bassetlaw Councils and the highways authorities setting out an agreed approach to managing and mitigating future growth and impacts on M1 junction 30. It would be beneficial to continue to engage with the Council in order to agree upon an approach for the future assessment of traffic impacts on the M1 and how these could be mitigated and delivered.	The Council will ensure that Highways England will continue to be involved in the local plan process.
DBLP129	Sara Stillard	Sturton le Steeple Parish Council	Welcome the prominence of Neighbourhood Plans in achieving the District's development targets and in stimulating and regulating development in the rural areas. It is unrealistic to expect the rural areas to accept 27% of the burden of new housing. In the case of Sturton le Steeple, this could be an additional 1-200 residents over the Plan, with consequences for the inadequate infrastructure, in particular transport, schools and GP surgeries. At present, public transport in Sturton le Steeple is limited to 6 buses per day, from Retford to Gainsborough. This does not allow flexibility for residents to make the journeys to fit with other services. Consequently, most resort to private cars, with the negative effect on the environment. Sturton le Steeple School, despite being modernised and extended, is at capacity. The only GP surgery is in North Leverton, and it is used by all surrounding Parishes. There are two partners and a locum. Waiting time for routine appointments is usually 3-4 weeks. The consulting rooms are at capacity, and there is no room for extension. The approach was to expect practices to join up. This would make patients, many of whom are aged and/or lacking mobility, to travel some distance. The lack of public transport will make this difficult and would not be consistent with Policy 24 10: Promote health and wellbeing by delivering new and enhanced infrastructure which will improve the quality of life in Bassetlaw: This is welcomed, as long as it keeps pace with developments. At present health resources are insufficient for the present population. An increase in population must be accompanied by a comparable contemporaneous increase in health resources, in particular GP surgeries. Note that health facilities are not included in para 19.9 as a specific area for support under Sect 106 agreements: 19.9 All new development covered by CIL criteria will be obligated to pay the CIL charge. Where necessary, some new development will also be subject to planning obligations (s106 agreements), particularly in relation to education, highway improvements, SuDS, and affordable housing provision. This should be amended.	Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council is required to engage a range of key stakeholders and infrastructure providers on the development of the Local Plan, including site allocations. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be produced which will set out how infrastructure will be provided to meet the needs of the Local Plan. This will include health facilities and education. Para 19.7 refers to developer contributions being used to ensure that adverse impacts of development on local services such as health facilities is appropriately mitigated. Health facilities are also referred to in Policy 24 2bii as being a potential recipient for infrastructure contributions.
DBLP138	L Carter	Bothamsall Parish Council	Supports the policies to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	Support for policies 23-24 noted and welcome.
DBLP142	M Malcolm	Ranskill Parish Council	Like to see further clarification in the plan regarding upgrades to services, infrastructure and public transport to be provided to cope with the increased population. The CIL rate proposed in the plan is £30 per square metre for residential properties. This is a very large reduction on the current rate of £55 per square metre in place in rural East Bassetlaw. The Plan requires that rural villages with very limited infrastructure and facilities take on increased population (at the rate of 2.5 people per dwelling the 119 houses to be built in Ranskill would amount an additional 300 residents). The current financial climate means that there are fewer grants available and although there will be a corresponding increase in Precept from new residents this does not provide sufficient finance for new projects and enhancements to village facilities. Welcome details regarding the rationale behind this as there seems to be no evidence that the current CIL rate has put off potential developers in East Bassetlaw.	An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be produced which will set out how infrastructure will be provided to meet the needs of the Local Plan. The Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Report provides the evidence for the reduction in the CIL rate across the District.
DBLP143	George Breed	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	CIL was first introduced by Bassetlaw in 1st Sept 2013 with 3 different charging zones identified for residential development: 1. Retford rural east E55 2. Workop rural west E20 3. Northwest Bassetlaw E5 The Plan indicates a viability assessment conducted Aug 2018 found no justification for this differential approach. Detail would be welcomed on regarding what stage Bassetlaw intends to implement this proposed change?	Following adoption of the Local Plan a CIL Examination will be required prior to adoption of a new CIL Charging Schedule. This is expected to be 2021-2022.
DBLP144	P Eaglen		Support the proposed policies that seek to safeguard infrastructure, transport, education, health, flood mitigation and open space.	Support for policies 23-24 noted and welcome.

DBLP151	D Kitson	Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd	Development should be located close to all necessary services including employment so that reliance upon the private motor car is reduced. This is at odds with some of the more proactive parts of this plan. This will be a thing of the past with the government limiting the production and sale of petrol/diesel cars in the UK and the increase in production and use of electric cars which are becoming more affordable. The problem will remain for many villages where the public bus service has been reduced. With this in private hands, only the most viable routes are retained, all others are lost. Services used to be regular, affordable and pleasant. In rural areas the use of smaller "buses" on a more frequent basis would attract more users. There are areas around the UK where authorities have embraced public transport for rural areas and they become the lifeline for such areas. Local and District Council used to have some control over bus routes but much has been lost. Some form of encouragement, support and directive by these bodies is required. If CIL money was used towards this rather than sitting in the Council's bank or carrying out highway improvements that are questionable then development would indeed have a positive impact upon the area, the wellbeing of communities and the general health and wellbeing of its occupants. Not suggesting that buses are the lifeline for Bassetlaw but they do have a part to play in reducing carbon production but helping with congestion which is a cause for concern, particularly with air quality.	Policy 24 supports the use of infrastructure contributions for public transport. The emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set out how infrastructure will be provided to meet the needs of the Local Plan.
DBLP155	E Jones	NHS Property Services Ltd	NHSPS manages, maintains and improves NHS properties and facilities, working in partnership with NHS organisations to create safe, efficient, sustainable and modern healthcare and working environments. NHSPS has a clear mandate to provide a quality service to its tenants and minimise the cost of the NHS estate to those organisations using it. Any savings made are passed back to the NHS. Policy 23 restricts the loss or change of existing 'community facilities'. NHSPS objects to the wording of this policy, specifically point 2. An essential element of supporting the wider transformation of NHS services and the health estate is to ensure that surplus and vacant NHS sites are not strategically constrained by local planning policies, particularly for providing alternative uses (principally housing). Faced with financial pressures, the NHS requires flexibility in its estate. The capital receipts and revenue savings generated from the disposal of unneeded or unsuitable sites and properties for best value is an important component in helping to provide funding for new or improved services and facilities. Policies aimed at preventing the loss or change of use of community facilities and assets, where healthcare is included within this definition, can have a harmful impact on the provision and quality of healthcare facilities and services, as it can prevent or delay the reinvestment of capital in modern and fit-for-purpose facilities and require ongoing revenue to be spent on maintaining inefficient parts of the estate. Most surplus healthcare facilities are purpose built and at the end of their useful lives, and highly unlikely to be viable or suitable for other uses. There are separate, rigorous testing and approval processes employed by NHS commissioners to identify unneeded and unsuitable healthcare facilities, including continued health service provision for the population. These must be satisfied prior to any property being declared surplus and put up for disposal. Much surplus NHS property is outdated and no longer suitable for modern healthcare or other C2 or D1 uses without significant investment. Where NHS commissioners can demonstrate that healthcare facilities are no longer required there should be a presumption that such sites are suitable for housing (or other appropriate uses) and should not be subject to restrictive policies or periods of marketing. NHSPS would only support Policy 23 if it is clear that evidence of the wider NHS estate reorganisation programme would be accepted as justification for the loss of a community facility, and would therefore be excluded from the requirements of this policy. NHSPS would support the inclusion of the following: The loss or change of use of existing health facilities will be acceptable if it is shown that this forms part of a wider estate reorganisation programme to ensure the continued delivery of services. Evidence of such a programme will be accepted as a clear demonstration that the facility under consideration is neither needed nor viable and that adequate facilities are or will be made available to meet the ongoing needs of the local population. In such cases Part A of Point 2 Policy 23 would not apply, and no viability or marketing information will be required. Without this further clarity, NHSPS would strongly object to Policy 23. The requirements of this policy are considered overly-onerous and inflexible.	It is important that the Local Plan adopts a fair and transparent approach to all community facilities and does not treat the consideration of one type of facility any differently to others. It should not be the case that health sites should be granted a presumption for housing or other uses - each site should be considered in the same way, or their merits. The Council would therefore encourage the NHSPS to work with the Council through the Local Plan process to identify potential unneeded or unsuitable sites so that these can be considered as part of the site selection process for alternative uses such as housing. If such sites become available once the Plan has been adopted a 12 month marketing period is not unreasonable to justify the loss of community facilities.
DBLP170	M Malcolm	East Markham Parish Council	Notes on page 128 Policy 24(1) the CIL rate has been equalised throughout the District. This will be detrimental to the rural areas of East Bassetlaw. Concerned that the reduction from £55 per sqm to £30 per sqm will result in less CIL monies available to Parish Councils to spend on village projects. Given that the villages of East Bassetlaw will not have the retail opportunities of the towns they will see an increase in population. It is vital that the existing rates are retained. The differential rates were not originally campaigned for, so there must have been a rational that justified the differences in the first instance and they should be retained. Concerned about other facilities within the area e.g. the ability of the local GP services to cope with the increased population. The new properties built in the village are unable to obtain a high-speed internet connection due to a lack of capacity in the system. This will severely impact on people who plan to start a business in the village or work from home. Notes that the plan does discuss community infrastructure, but does not specifically include the provision of internet access nor indeed any improvement in other facilities. Examples of what is proposed and how it can be financed would be welcome.	The Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Report provides the evidence for the reduction in the CIL rate across the District. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be produced which will set out how infrastructure will be provided to meet the needs of the Local Plan.
DBLP172	J Buckwell	dha planning on behalf of Laing O'Rourke	Strongly welcome the proposal to remove the current CIL charge for employment development. The current CIL charge of £15/sqm (+ factoring) has proved to be a significant constraint to the delivery of large employment buildings at EIP. Nearly every other local authority that has introduced CIL has recognised that CIL charges on general employment uses adversely affect the viability of job-creating projects, so strongly support this proposal. Strongly welcome section 4 of the policy, which recognises that in certain circumstances it may be acceptable to consider a reduction in the extent of planning obligations where this threatens the viability and deliverability of development.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	Pleased to note the inclusion of Green Infrastructure in Policy 24.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP192	B Lomas	Johnson Mowat on behalf of Barratt Homes	Question the inclusion of a CIL charge of £30 per square metre for residential development, which differs from information contained in the current charging schedule on the Council's website (dated September 2013). The current CIL includes three residential charging zones, varying from £55, £20, and £5. The charging zone in Harworth (North West Bassetlaw charging zone) is £5 per square metre. The proposed amendments to the CIL are recommended by the Council's CIL Viability Assessment (August 2018) this has not been tested and should not be included in the Policy. Given the viability implication associated with the adopted Community Infrastructure Levy and the additional requirement to deliver contributions to primary school education, the Council should undertake a wide ranging viability assessment of the Local Plan prior to the publication of the next document.	It is acknowledged that the CIL rate in Policy 24 is that proposed by the Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Report and has not undergone testing at CIL Examination. Therefore reference to the proposed rates will be deleted from Policy 24. A Whole Plan Viability Assessment will be undertaken to inform the next version of the emerging Local Plan.
DBLP221	B Weedall	Gladman Developments	Raise concerns over the proposed CIL charge as it has not been subject to independent examination and should not be implemented. This element of the policy should be deleted. It is clear from the policy 12 that the Garden Villages will be providing necessary mitigation 'across the board' and included as part of the planning obligation. There should be no additional requirements for a CIL contribution for any further mitigation projects.	It is acknowledged that the CIL rate in Policy 24 is that proposed by the Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Report and has not undergone testing at CIL Examination. Therefore reference to the proposed rates will be deleted from Policy 24. A Whole Plan Viability Assessment will be undertaken to inform the next version of the emerging Local Plan. Further work will be undertaken to determine the impacts of securing infrastructure for the Garden Villages alongside a CIL rate.
DBLP229	S Ashton		Supports the policies to deliver and safeguard infrastructure. The delivery of key physical and social infrastructure will be provided by the Community Infrastructure Levy and for residential development this is set at £30 sqm. The proposal at Church Farm, Hayton could deliver the appropriate CIL payment. In addition it could deliver the appropriate amount of new affordable housing through a Section 106 Agreement.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP255	S Green	Home Builders Federation	Policy 24 sets out the Council's proposed CIL charge of £30 per square metre for residential development however this CIL charge has not yet been subject to independent examination. The setting out of this charge in Policy 24 is inappropriate. This policy requirement should be modified before the publication of the pre-submission Local Plan consultation.	It is acknowledged that the CIL rate in Policy 24 is that proposed by the Interim Whole Plan and CIL Viability Report and has not undergone testing at CIL Examination. Therefore reference to the proposed rates will be deleted from Policy 24. A Whole Plan Viability Assessment will be undertaken to inform the next version of the emerging Local Plan.
DBLP262	S Patience	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Support Policy 24 as it states that the provision of infrastructure and infrastructure improvements will be required to make the development proposals acceptable (in Planning terms) and that planning conditions will be used to secure this where appropriate.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP267	D Backhouse	Sustrans Bassetlaw	Strongly support Policy 23 – New Community Facilities, paragraph 1 a: especially sustainable transport links to schools	Support for policy 23 noted and welcome.
DBLP270	D Troop		For rural areas, "local need" must mean "Parish Need". Do not expect land values in one village to be paying for facilities in other villages.	Local need is defined by the second sentence of Policy 23 as being close to the development or within the appropriate catchment for the community facilities. This will vary by facility to it would be inappropriate to define local needs as Parish needs.
DBLP267	D Backhouse	Sustrans Bassetlaw Rangers	Strongly support Policy 24 – Infrastructure funding, paragraph 2 a i: developer contributions for cycling and walking provision.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP270	D Troop		The flat rate for residential CIL across the district is welcomed although it is not known whether that proposed flat rate is viable. In Everton, land values are eroded by (catchment) secondary school results that are significantly below the national average: DFES grades A-C GCSE results inc: Maths and English Elizabethan School Retford also Retford Oaks), meaning that many parents will feel bound to find/pay for "alternative" provision. The Council will need to support developers where Notts CC issue s106 contribution demands when they are not required. In 2016 signed a s106 giving payment to Notts CC education despite a large number of vacancies in the Neighbouring School (Mattersey Primary) within maximum walking distances. Those vacancies had arisen as a result of poor results/management meaning that Mattersey parents were/are choosing to access Everton Primary in preference to their own. Our site was penalised by poor educational performance in a neighbouring village with Notts CC behaviour exhortative (see 16/01656/OUT). Our solicitor was extremely unhappy with the Bassetlaw Open Space policy wording and it took a significant amount of time to elicit acceptable clarification from the Open Space Team. Policy 24 makes reference to contributions for affordable housing delivery yet the DCLG formula used to calculate the district's 5 year land supply, has enabled the eradication of the Bassetlaw housing "non-delivery" backlog. The specific element of the formula that has allowed the district to "scrub" the backlog is the affordability ratio. The affordability ratio for Bassetlaw, is one of the lowest in the country.	Developer contributions can only be secured where they are necessary to mitigate the impacts arising from new development as defined by paragraph 19.8. A Developer Contributions SPD will be prepared to provide further details relating to how, when and for what purpose developer contributions will be sought.
DBLP271	Anonymous		Supported. It has got to include a new doctor's surgery. Worktop GPs can't cope as it is now. Also it has got to include a new secondary school with higher education. Make sure it has a good bus route - not everyone has got a car.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.

DBLP273	J. Rogers	Friends of Woodlands and Coachwood Green Ltd	A tourist attraction should be created to develop local leisure and recreation facilities with its accompanying rural economic benefits. Woodlands Country Park and the adjacent Chesterfield Canal, National Cycle Route 6 and the Cuckoo Way provide a unique opportunity in Bassetlaw which should be central to enhancing the natural build and historic environment. These facilities will promote the Health and Wellbeing of residents and visitors.	The Local Plan supports the appropriate provision of leisure and recreation facilities and cycling infrastructure. However, the Local Plan can only identify facilities which are deliverable. Unfortunately without a deliverable scheme this type of facility cannot be allocated in the Local Plan.
DBLP273	J. Rogers	Friends of Woodlands and Coachwood Green Ltd	Traffic management is a major national concern, specifically in Shireoaks it is a major and growing problem. Shireoaks Row with its lack of parking for residents results in parking on both sides of the road with only a narrow gap inadequate for two larger vehicles to pass. With two businesses requiring access to large lorries day and night via Shireoaks Common and many people using the roads through the village as a shortcut to the A619 it is only a matter of time before a serious incident occurs. It is very important to the health and wellbeing of residents that this traffic problem is resolved.	The next version of the Local Plan will include policies relating to transport infrastructure. This will also include provision of parking standards for new development in the District.
DBLP296	975737		Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP301	977042		Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP303	978627		Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP304	986292		Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP308	986480		No support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP314	987642		No support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure. back to basics ! the current situation in Bassetlaw is currently struggling and needs a more direct approach to providing the area and therefore the people a more sustainable answer to the current problems.	Comments noted.
DBLP315	987680		Closure of Gamston would certainly be a loss of infrastructure.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP317	987880		Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP318	987892		Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP319	987959		Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure. Safeguarding infrastructure like a local airfield is essential to the prosperity of the area and the country.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP325	988054		Do not support the infrastructure policies. What about safeguarding the current infrastructure at Gamston Airport? This is a thriving airport and flying community. Instead it would be better to see a plan that includes the airport - perhaps supporting it's growth for example.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP326	988057		Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP328	988061		Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP330	988064		Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure provided it wouldn't result in the loss of Gamston Airfield.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP333	988091		Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure provided it wouldn't result in the loss of Gamston Airfield.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP336	988172		Support for policies which seek to deliver infrastructure. Yes so that's why we should keep airport as a transport link and used for air ambulance	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP339	988184		No support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Comments noted.
DBLP343	988216		Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP344	988235		Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP345	988237		No support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Comments noted.
DBLP346	988247		No support for infrastructure policies. No it never works with large developments it just causes problems elsewhere - Spend time trying to cross a road in Retford Town or near the retail park !! Journey times longer pollution greater because of stop start at traffic/predestrian lights.	Comments noted.
DBLP349	988325		Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP350	988344		Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP357	Scrooby		Item 3, must be taken to mean an enhancement of and not a replacement of the community building, a Village Hall for example.	Policy 23 3 does not refer to replacement of a community building.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Support for infrastructure delivery policies. But will have an effect on the deliverability of the housing requirement.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP359	988461		Infrastructure. It proposes "Health provision" yet will be making the air ambulance based at Gamston without a base.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP363	988482		Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP364	988487		Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP371	988500		Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP372	988501		Support for infrastructure delivery and safeguarding policies if proposal takes the needs of local villages into account by protecting our need for lower vehicle usage on roads not designed to carry the number or size of vehicles that already use the smaller villages as a means of getting away or to the A1 an Retford.	The Council works with the Highways Authority to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the local road network.
DBLP373	988503		Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure. Why not improve the infrastructure to already existing areas such as Worksop and improve education and health provision there?	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all development sites can be accommodated by the infrastructure network. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. This could include health and education provision in Worksop.
DBLP375	988527		Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP376	988557		Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP384	988726		Support for policies relating to infrastructure delivery. Broadly we support the policy of ensuring that appropriate policies are put in place to safeguard and allow for future infrastructure provision	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP385	988746		Only support infrastructure policies. There are options for the proposed siting of the new development ,and the option for placing it on the airport should not even be considered. Housing developments are essential, but in the correct locations and not at the detriment to local thriving businesses and the loss of highly skilled workers	Comments noted.
DBLP386	988747		Support infrastructure policies. Transport improvements are essential. One of my reasons for opposing the Gamston development is that the A1 is already over crowded and there are accidents daily on it. Without significant improvement this would only get worse. There is land available in East Markham for the development of a secondary school land on Great Lane fields on both sides of the road and a very large field adjacent too it, all in common ownership. Again Bassetlaw don't seem interested in wrking with landowners	The Council works with Highways England and the Highways Authority to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the strategic and local road network. A new secondary school is not required in East Markham.
DBLP387	988748		No support. Killing off General Aviation is a backward step for transport, employment and global business. If anything the airport should be enhanced to allow business aviation useage. In 2005 there were about 100,000 airport/aerodrome pairs in Europe served by General and Business aviation traffic (as opposed to about 30,000 linked by scheduled airline connections). Only 5% of them had a scheduled flight per working day). The same pattern remains when we look at the city-pairs. In 2005 General and Business aviation in Europe served over 80.000 city pairs. Vast majority of this traffic was between city-pairs that had only very limited scheduled alternative (less then one scheduled flight per working day).	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP388	988749		Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure. Needs to be better schools to support the high number of people with low levels of academic ability in the area.	The Council works with NCC Education to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing education facilities. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified.
DBLP389	988774		No support. The proposed solutions do not deliver and safeguard infrastructure and transport facilities - the destruction of the airport removes from both the Council area and the nation a useful facility which is not otherwise available. Doncaster-Sheffield is too far to the north, and Humberside and East Midlands too far away to the east and south respectively.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP391	988813		Do not support the infrastructure policies. Safeguard should include keeping a useful airfield	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP392	988889		Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure. We are a group of rural communities, urbanising the environment has a significant reduction in the quality of life for those who choose a less 'built up' environment.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.

DBLP393	989007		Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure. So why propose getting rid of an airport. In the 22nd century we may all be travelling more by local air services??	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP394	989023		Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP398	989658		No support. At the consultation event the person to whom I spoke was very vague about plans for increased health care, education provision and infrastructure. Clearly the current provision would not support the number of individuals who could move into the area and the thinking about the global needs did not seem to be joined up.	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing facilities. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP399	989741		No support. The threat to Gamston Airport means you are not safeguarding the current infrastructure.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP402	990030		No support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure	Comments noted.
DBLP403	990043		No support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	Comments noted.
DBLP404	990059		No support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure. Later buses would help.	Comments noted.
DBLP405	990062		Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure. The enhancement of footpaths, cycle and bridleways is positive. A 'green bridge' over the A1 to link Bevercotes to Retford would be good if it could be located to the Robin Hood site to encourage custom to it (the field at the back of the pub would be ideal). There are significant transport improvements that would be needed and these have not been addressed in the plan. It reads as if the road network is suitable in its present form and this is far from accurate. We have a rural road network. Building new schools at Bevercotes and Gamston would likely render the existing schools at Walesby, Elkesley, Ordasil and the existing one at Gamston redundant. Removing the Elkesley school would take away a major asset of the village and a reason why people move there. Why cant the existing schools be developed and extended? If new schools are built then until that point the current ones will have to take more children, become overcrowded and then see numbers drop making their long term planning extremely difficult.	Support for footpaths, cyclepaths and bridleways and green bridge is noted. The Council will work with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing facilities including roads and education. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP407	990068		Do not support. We are suffering with extra traffic , speeding through the village of Eaton currently. If on average we look at 2 to 3 cars per new household the local village roads struggling now , litter is also a major problems	The Council works with Highways England and the Highways Authority to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the strategic and local road network.
DBLP408	990070		Don't support infrastructure policies. I would if they were built first and plans in place before the dwellings But how many schemes start on promises	Developer contributions are secured via a legal agreement binding the developer and/or landowner to make the provision at a specific point in time. Although it is possible to secure infrastructure prior to housing, it is common practice for a number of properties to be occupied prior to receipt of the infrastructure - there is no need for the infrastructure until the residents occupy the dwellings.
DBLP409	990071		Support. Yes supporting the preservation of Gamston airport, and the education that takes place there.	Comments noted.
DBLP410	990076		Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP411	990079		No support for infrastructure policies. No as I don't believe they are sufficient to safeguard any of these	Comments noted.
DBLP415	990150		Support the proposed amendments to the Community Infrastructure Levy restricting charges to residential and food supermarket retail proposals	Support noted and welcome.
DBLP416	990240		No support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure. Do not believe that the majority of these proposals are within the Bassetlaw Remit; Highways are the responsibility of the County Council, who seem to be currently unable to resolve the issues that are keeping Twyford Bridge (over the A1) as a 'single line operation' with the use of an extremely expensive Traffic Light System. Public Transport is generally a private venture supported by Grants from the County Council/National Government. I do not see how Bassetlaw can have any input to this. If that Authority does have influence then it should seek to reinstate local Bus Services to communities that are 'cut off'. The Local Schools supply and capacity is not within the remit of the Bassetlaw Authority. Health Centres are not within the remit of the Bassetlaw Authority. There are already many natural areas for relaxation and enjoyment within the local area. Communication Infrastructure is either Privately or County Authority/National Government supported, not within the remit of the Bassetlaw Authority.	Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council is required to engage a range of key stakeholders and infrastructure providers on the development of the Local Plan. Although much infrastructure is not provided by the Council, the infrastructure providers are expected to positively engage to help ensure that the Local Plan is deliverable. This will be set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Statements of Common Ground will be used to ensure infrastructure is delivered.
DBLP418	990387		Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP419	990400		Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP420	990465		Don't support policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure because Gamston Airport is infrastructure which isn't proposed to be safeguarded.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP421	990489		Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP422	990506		Don't support policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure	Comments noted.
DBLP423	990541		Support for policies which seek to deliver and safeguard infrastructure	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP424	990549		Don't support. The airfield forms part of the transport infrastructure which should be retained.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP425	990570		Don't support. Closing Gamston does the opposite!	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP426	990571		Don't support	Comments noted.
DBLP427	990577		Don't support. How is our policy of building on green and open space in any way compatible with the safeguarding you propose?	Policies 18 and 20 seek to protect and enhance green infrastructure unless in exceptional circumstances when criteria are met. This is consistent with national policy.
DBLP428	990594		Don't support. Loss of airfield would have a massive effect on local economy	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP429	990613		Support	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP430	990614		Don't support. This is not supporting transport networks. It's closing an important hub at a high local cost for many.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP431	990633		Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP434	990659		Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP435	990666		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP436	990682		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP437	990704		Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP438	990717		Don't support.	Comments noted.
DBLP439	990719		Don't support. You cant do what you are suppose to be doing now let alone increase the demand on this. The council needs to tick a box and you are doing this to the detriment of your residents and the landscape. It is smoke and mirrors and nothing proposed will live up to the carefully written housing plan. The bridge near Gamston over the A1 - strange how this has not been fixed. Is the council delaying this until the consultation is over! Corruption evident, from the poorly promoted consultation events in the hope this would all be pushed through behind closed doors.	Comments noted.
DBLP440	990764		Don't support	Comments noted.
DBLP441	990783		Don't support	Comments noted.
DBLP442	990799		Support. Yes, if the garden village proposed for Gamston is abandoned.	Comments noted.
DBLP443	990800		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP444	990802		Do not support. The rationale for the proposed two sites appears to be that they are both close to the A1 and B6387 connects the two sites and provides good connectivity with Retford and the East Coast mainline. On looking at the map that may seem appropriate but realistically the B road is narrow in places with bad bends and the A1 slip roads are short and the immediate stretch of the A1 is congested. Also this part of the A1 has had several accidents even since the Elkesley bridge has been finished. Local villages such as Bevercotes and Eaton are going to be seen as more 'rat runs' than currently and therefore dangerous with narrow roads, bad bends and Eaton and Gamston bridges both significantly causing many road accidents. Surely with 10000 extra people in the area it will mean that there will be too many vehicles for this updated road infrastructure. I cannot see that the house builders would be interested in investing in an updated road infrastructure until after the first 15 years. Retford Train Station surroundings and parking areas are already packed. There is mention that 40000 journeys are made to use Retford Station now never mind when an extra 10000 people are living in the area!!	The Council works with Highways England and the Highways Authority to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the strategic and local road network.

DBLP445	990806		Do not support	Comments noted.
DBLP446	990814		Do not support. The amount of additional hard standing will mean extra run off and put more pressure on existing drainage systems.	The Council works with the Environment Agency, Anglian Water and Severn Trent to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the infrastructure network. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP447	990818		Do not support	Comments noted.
DBLP448	990826		Do not support. If two new villages are built at Gamston & Bevercotes, this would put an enormous strain on the public services & road systems in the area. This would increase the amount of pollution in the area, rather than improve the environment, so I believe the council should only look to allow the building of new homes in any village or town by small numbers.	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the existing network. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP449	990829		Do not support	Comments noted.
DBLP450	990836		Do not support	Comments noted.
DBLP451	990837		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP452	990841		Do not support. I cannot imagine that these policies make any more sense than the proposal, so NO.	Comments noted.
DBLP453	990842		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP454	990843		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP455	990845		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP456	990846		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP457	990847		Do not support. Infrastructure within the proposed housing developments only appears to have been considered, there is no information around access and impact on infrastructure leading too and from the sites.	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the existing network. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP458	990848		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP459	990849		Do not support. Areodromes are open space, transport infrastructure that requires protection as per government policy.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP460	990850		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP461	990852		Do not support. The benefits of having transport opportunities from Gamston Airport are being ignored.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP462	990854		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP463	990855		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP464	990856		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP465	990859		Do not support. I cant support policies that ran we lose and important facility such as Gamston airport.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP466	990862		Do not support. This is incorrect, you are destroying current infrastructure. Costing private families at least tens of thousands. Removing jobs from people with specialist skills that will have to re-locate to find similar employment.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP467	990865		Support. But you're getting rid of one of the most vibrant GA airfields! Gamston airport is an essential GA hub. It is thriving and vibrant. Replacing it with a village would remove a vital piece of infrastructure in the region.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP468	990869		Do not support. Keep Gamston airport.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP469	990882		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP470	990884		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP471	990885		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP472	990886		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP473	990889		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP474	990891		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP475	990893		Do not support. No because they don't safeguard the infrastructure of Gamston airfield.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP476	990895		Support	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP477	990901		Support. Building over 6000 homes on an active airfield will not help climate change, natural habitats for wild life and will remove an open green space	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP478	990904		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP479	990910		Do not support. The assessment does not appear to be thorough in terms of road capacity and road safety as this falls to the responsibility of the county council and highways England. The characteristics of many of the roads surrounding villages and smaller settlements are not constructed to a modern standard conducive to modern vehicles and driving. Nor does there appear to be an acknowledgement of this. The Council do not hold the remit for school provision. Gamston C of E Primary and the County maintained Elkesley Primary Schools are near to capacity, but serve their local communities well. Whilst it is suggested the new Garden Villages would have their own schools, it is not envisaged that these would be up and running prior the completion of the first phase of 600 properties. So where would these children go. New schools are only authorised when existing demand proves the need for investment and this is assessed at Notts County Council. This is a non political process which only becomes an obligation with certain criteria. In the meantime, the pressure would be on the existing facilities.	The Council works with Highways England and the Highways Authority to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the strategic and local road network as well as NCC in relation to education. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP480	990912		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP481	990913		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP482	990914		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP483	990915		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP484	990916		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP485	990917		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP486	990918		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP487	990919		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP488	990921		Support. If you're serious about safeguarding; open space, transport, education. Closing a STEM enabling site such as an airport, is stupid. Would never known about Retford if it hadn't been for the airport. Would never have wanted or needed to go, but because of the airport have spent and invested money that airport. Money supporting local families and business, also council taxes. You would lose a lot of tax from airport closure	Comments noted.
DBLP489	990922		Do not support the proposed policies regarding infrastructure including the transport, education ect. The major factor here is that a huge part of the areas infrastructure (Gamston Airport) will be removed which provides a huge part in the local community. There are 3 flying schools to my knowledge teaching people anything from the Private Pilots License upto commercial level. These skills and training is something that the normal education system cannot provide. This airport provides more skilled jobs that what would be created with villages in the long term ie low skilled shop workers.	Comments noted.
DBLP490	990926		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP491	990928		Do not support.	Comments noted.

DBLP492	990930		Do not support. It removes infrastructure - aka the airfield. Likely as drone technology and electric flight becomes a reality to be a big loss for the area.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP493	990933		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP494	990934		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP495	990936		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP496	990937		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP497	990938		Do not support. Eaton is a tiny village, it cannot cope with an influx of houses with the added traffic. They'll not be enough spaces in schools to support this	The Council works with Highways England and the Highways Authority to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the strategic and local road network as well as NCC in relation to education. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP498	990940		Do not support. I hardly class destroying Gamston Airport as stipulated in paragraph 10.3 as safeguarding infrastructure. Particularly the transport infrastructure provided by the airport. I also see contradiction with paragraph 10.5 which speaks of seeking to support opportunities in order to retain and create.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP499	990942		Do not support. How does closing the airfield improve transport links? The open space is much better at flood mitigation than any housing estate. Flying training, aircraft maintenance apprenticeships and other jobs are all vocational education.	Comments noted.
DBLP500	990943		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP501	990944		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP502	990946		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP503	M Turner		Do not support. Instead of destroying vital national infrastructure and skilled jobs could support the airport and build an economic hub. The destruction of Retford Gamston Airport would remove a vital local and national facility that is virtually impossible to re-create once destroyed. The plan would displace 10 independent businesses and over 50 based aircraft, including business jets and the Children's Air Ambulance helicopter, with no alternative accommodation in the area. The Draft local plan has significant flaws in this area and chiefly ignores the national requirement to maintain a strategic network of airfields as outlined in paragraph 104f of the NPPF. It fails to Consider "the importance of maintaining business, leisure, training and emergency service needs" and Paragraph 10.3 disregards the locally and nationally significant transport infrastructure provided by the airport. The aims for development at the airport also contradict paragraph 10.5 which seeks to support such opportunities.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP504	990949		Support	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP505	C Taylor		Do not support. This type of infrastructure should be in place as standard policy . The present infrastructure is not adequate for the current level of housing that we have now without adding to it.	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the infrastructure network. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP506	990952		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP507	990954		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP508	990955		Do not support. Transport infrastructure alone does not show how surrounding villages and traffic bottle necks will be protected or improved to the levels required today let alone with the addition of 9149.4 additional vehicles in the bassetlaw area after the building of 6630 houses (1.38 vehicles per household, east of England, www.statista.com)	The Council works with Highways England and the Highways Authority to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by the strategic and local road network as well as NCC in relation to education. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP509	990959		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP510	990961		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP511	990962		Support. But there is no need to close Gamston airport to do this.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP512	990964		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP513	990965		Support	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP514	990980		Support. YOU ARE NOT SAFEGUARDING TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE - YOU'RE DESTROYING A PERFECTLY GOOD ACTIVE AIRFIELD!!!!!!!!!!!! which provides transport links for local businesses, provides lots of skilled job opportunities, and can attract visitors to the area!! The airport has flourished for the last thirty years, yet you are proposing to demolish it.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP515	991045		Do not support. The plan will destroy instead of safeguard transport infrastructure. You have ignored aviation and how strongly local people feel about their airport. I hope you review your plans.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP516	991153		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP517	991157		Do not support. There needs to be alot more done in the Retford area before any new projects are introduced the infrastructure now in certain areas is cracking there is land built on many years ago that still floods the roads through and around the town get gridlocked regularly that is even before anything happens on the A1 around Markham Moor and Elkesley (which unfortunately it does on a regular basis). If one new garden village was proposed around Bevercotes that would create it's own infrastructure that would have less of a detrimental impact on the immediate area around Retford and it's neighbouring villages which need to be kept as rural villages.	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP518	991172		Do not support. Although the plan is all assumptions as BDC does not have the power to manage transport, education and health, these are managed by other agencies, just as it can't insist on developers delivering new facilities. This plan should show a commitment fro the other agencies and this plan needs to go out to consultation again without the cost cutting exercise in order to gain any appropriate responses from local residents.	Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council is required to engage a range of key stakeholders and infrastructure providers on the development of the Local Plan. Although much infrastructure is not provided by the Council, the infrastructure providers are expected to positively engage to help ensure that the Local Plan is deliverable. Statements of Common Ground will be used to ensure infrastructure is deliverable.
DBLP519	991173		Support. Who wouldn't.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP520	991174		Do not support. The plan is all assumptions as BDC does not have the power to manage transport, education and health, just as it can't insist on developers delivering new facilities. There needs to be some sort of agreement from the other agencies that buy into this plan before I can agree to this. the plan needs to go back out to consultation without the cost cutting exercise so that appropriate responses from villagers can be made.	Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council is required to engage a range of key stakeholders and infrastructure providers on the development of the Local Plan. Although much infrastructure is not provided by the Council, the infrastructure providers are expected to positively engage to help ensure that the Local Plan is deliverable. Statements of Common Ground will be used to ensure infrastructure is deliverable.
DBLP521	991176		Do not support. No - even if efficient policies are put in place, it does not alter the fact that all this new development would radically change the countryside in Bassetlaw leading to loss of village life and rural living as we know it.	Comments noted.

DBLP522	991178		Do not support. If the development goes ahead as residential there are roughly 6 car movements a day which will total over 24000 per day when the development is completed .as we know there will have to be a complete upgrade of Twyford Bridge , but what about the rest of the A1 ? how will that be improved for the increase in traffic flow . What provision is being made for the upgrade of the smaller roads A lot of traffic will go through Eaton Village which has poor road structure and cant cope now when there is an accident on the A1, Ollereton Road leading on to Jockey Lane /Brick yard Road again is very poor and would need a complete upgrade . The Road from the A1 to Gamston although better quality as many bad bends ,there are already numerous accidents which I feel would only get worse with the increased traffic flow , more street lights needed and maybe a cycle path . As for Education , it will be years before a new primary school or secondary school is needed ,but if new schools were to be built on the new sites then pressure would be put on the existing local schools which are struggling as it is . I cant see new health centres being a priority at the moment there are staff shortages in the hospitals we have already got (and Schools for that matter) so what makes the council think people would want to work at these smaller sites when generally they like to work at the more specialist units .	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP523	991181		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP524	991184		Do not support - do exactly the opposite of "delivering and safeguarding infrastructure". As already mentioned above the draft plan totally fails to comply with the NPPF, as its stated objective, by virtue of the fact that it has failed to recognise or act upon paragraph 104 f) of the NPPF and therefore totally fails "to deliver and safeguard infrastructure" by proposing the closure of Retford Gamston Airport that is already acting as a strategic hub for business within Bassetlaw. And how also is it delivering and safeguarding infrastructure when the closure of Retford Gamston Airport will also result in the closure of a total of 11 businesses that require to operate from an airport, the loss of a training facility for Nottinghamshire Police, a base for a Children's Air Ambulance helicopter and the loss of almost 100 jobs (a large number of which are STEM), the loss of 96 hectares of actively farmed arable land, as well as all the direct benefits to the local economy?	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP525	991186		Support. Yes, but not in the context of the currently proposed developments.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP526	991188		Do not support. This plan does not safeguard the current infrastructure at Gamston Airport. It seeks to destroy it.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP527	991190		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP528	991208		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP529	991209		A District wide CIL rate will see developers favouring rural locations as the margins on sale will be greater. Proposing that zone rates still apply to counter the rural effect	Comments noted.
DBLP529	991209		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP530	991219		Do not support. Any schools built will have to be huge to cater for all new children moving into the houses. Not all will have children, however those that do will potentially have more than 1 child. So there could be potentially 4000 children minimum to house in the schools. The village schools that already exist cannot educate anywhere near that number, so any new school will have to extremely big. What an eyesore for a 'village location'. Open spaces.....will these all be accessible by foot for existing residents in Gamston? There are no pavements after Muttonshire Hill en route to the airport and that road is very busy and has a speed limit of 50mph (but will be in excess of that by motorists). I would not want to walk my children along there unless much better provisions are put in place to assist with their safety. If I had to drive to these open spaces, it would defeat the object of having them on the doorstep.	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP531	991221		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP532	Gareth Evans		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP533	991230		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP534	991231		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP535	991234		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP536	991235		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP537	991237		Do not support. Again what's in the plan will not be delivered. I do not believe that you, the Council will deliver the infrastructure required to support the Plan.	Comments noted.
DBLP538	991240		Do not support. I can not support policies that do not exist! Specifically went to one of the consultation meetings to ask about the supporting policies around the housing strategy and was told that they did not exist and would not exist as they are only developed once the housing development is started and approved ! Asked about; 1. Bassetlaw hospital/NHS funding and growth plans 2. Dental practices 3. Road networks and developments 4. Public transport plans for the future You have no plans for any of the above and so I can not agree to this question.	Policy 24 sets out the way the Council will ensure that infrastructure required to mitigate the impacts of development is sought. The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP539	991241		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP540	991243		Do not support. You're not safeguarding transport or education by getting rid of Gamston Airport. Not only does Gamston support General Aviation in the area, it educates new pilots and support a number of full time jobs.	Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP541	991264		Do not support. This development safeguards nothing in terms of infrastructure. It adds risk and demand to housing required infrastructure including water demand in a resource limited area. It removes the only airfield infrastructure in the area capable of serving a significant an economically active segment of the population. In infrastructure terms it is actually completely harmful as a proposal.	Protecting infrastructure is covered by other topic specific policies in the Local Plan. Paragraph 19.1 defines infrastructure in the context of Policy 24. This does not include an airfield.
DBLP542	991336		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP543	991990		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP544	992014		Support. Please do not destroy our aviation heritage at Gamston Airport.	Comments noted.
DBLP545	992366		Support.	Support for policy 24 noted and welcome.
DBLP546	992635		Do not support. Usually houses are built without any regard to infrastructure.	Policy 24 sets out the way the Council will ensure that infrastructure required to mitigate the impacts of development is sought. The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP547	993337		Do not support.	Comments noted.
DBLP548	993387		Do not support.	Comments noted.
Appendices				
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		Representation refers to Para 104 of the NPPF ab, b and f.	References to NPPF paragraph 104 is noted.
DBLP179	W Lam	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Public Highway to the north west of Worksop and south of Rotherham, in particular the A57: The Council's highway officer welcomes this issue being picked up through the Local Plan as the increased pressure of development along the A57 corridor, from both authorities, requires a strategic approach to the management of traffic along this important link. The continued growth of housing and employment land in Worksop has prompted investment in the immediate transport infrastructure around the vicinity of the sites but the wider distributional impact on the whole route (into Rotherham) needs to be considered. Agree with the shared approach transport assessment although the Inspector may question "what is it". The Council as the highway authority do not have any specific plan to address this issue and it would be for BDC and NCC to demonstrate. This will be a challenging issue as the Council would not want anything to further impact the Rotherham network whereas NCC would not want this constraint to implicate their development. A Statement of Common Ground is the next step to which the Council would welcome a discussion and agreed approach.	The Council will continue to work with Rotherham Metropolitan District Council through Duty to Cooperate requirements and will ensure all necessary Statements of Common Ground are in place as the Local Plan progresses.
DBLP211	A. Harrison	Bawtry Town Council	Bawtry Town Council would like to register the wish to be consulted about the content of the Statement of Common Ground with DMBC, as opposed to this simply being consultation with DMBC.	The Council will have a statement of Common Ground with DMBC and this is between the two authorities. BDC will explore the potential of a SoCG with Bawtry TC at the relevant time.
DBLP215	M. Lynam	Sheffield City Region	Supportive of work that has already taken place, and keen to continue positive working relations.	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP284	N Ward	Doncaster Council	Under the heading Sheffield City Region, it states that "The Council has received no requests from the other members to address their development needs" Doncaster Council emailed Bassetlaw District Council on 27 September 2018 with a formal request to respond to a table setting out potential strategic/cross boundary issues and formally asking whether Bassetlaw would be in a position to allocate land for housing in the Bassetlaw Local Plan in order to contribute to meeting some of Doncaster's housing need. Follow up emails were also sent. Still awaiting a response.	The Council acknowledges that a request for addressing Doncaster's development needs has been received. This is clarified in the next version of the Local Plan.
General				

DBLP18	C Redford		Express surprise at the lack of other options when attending my local Local Plan consultation considering it is meant to be only draft plans.	Comments noted.
DBLP19	Mrs Davies	Harworth and Bircotes Town Council	The Town Council welcomes the opportunity for consultation with/and views of the local community.	Support for consultation noted and welcome.
DBLP19	Mrs Davies	Harworth and Bircotes Town Council	It is well structured and makes clear the objectives of the Plan and the relevant planning policies influencing the priorities such as: - a balanced approach to housing growth, economic development and retail/leisure facilities in Bassetlaw, plus recognition of the need for conservation of local heritage; - a balanced approach that is underpinned by the intention to deliver the strategic priorities of the area; - the acknowledgement that where is housing growth, it should be in a managed way; - it is pleasing that the Plan recognises the differences between settlements, pays attention to the rural community and continues to support Neighbourhood Plans; - it is reassuring that the Plan pays attention to the priorities, plans and aspirations for future developments as detailed in Neighbourhood Plans	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP31	Clfr J Ogle		Rubbish	Comments noted.
DBLP32	H Bennett		There is a desperate need in Wheatley for smaller properties for single/2 person families. Older residents wanting to downsize find it increasingly difficult as all building work - either new or renovation seems to be focused on providing larger dwellings.	Comments noted.
DBLP32	H Bennett		Developments which allow for multiple dwellings to share one access are beginning to put a strain on the roads around the village as there is inadequate provision of parking within the curtilage of individual properties leading to on street parking.	Comments noted.
DBLP59	G Holland	Styrup with Oldcotes Parish Council	Oldcotes is incorrectly spelt throughout the document	Noted. Reference to Oldcotes will be changed in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP74	S Beard	Sport England	Refers to Sport England web site for information regarding the importance of planning for sport – active recreation and the health and wellbeing of communities. Refers to website for information on forward planning and policy development. Sport England does not have a statutory planning remit to protect open space but we are concerned that the loss of POS or incidental open space within residential areas could be promoted. Sport England's strategy (Towards and Active Nation) seeks to move the inactive to active. Our evidence suggests that access to open space near to where people live is a strong factor to moving people from inactive to active particularly in areas of deprivation. https://www.sportengland.org/active-nation/our-strategy/	Comments noted.
DBLP91	S Freek	Highways England	Understand that moving forward the Council will be undertaking Transport Assessments to underpin the Plan, and this is welcomed. Highways England will be happy to engage with the Council on proposed transport assessments related to the operation of the SRN and its junctions. Note that both an Infrastructure Capacity Study and Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be produced in support of the Local Plan and this is welcomed by Highways England as a means of understanding the impact of growth on the SRN.	The Council will continue to work with Highways England through Duty to Cooperate requirements and will welcome guidance on site selection to inform the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP97	M Naylor	Lound Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Lound Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group have been working on a Neighbourhood Plan since early 2016. Would like to take this opportunity to thank you for all the help and guidance which BDC has provided us over this time. Of particular assistance was attendance at our committee meeting on 7 February and subsequent joint consultation event on 12 February.	Comments welcome and noted.
DBLP119	M Lindsley	The Coal Authority	The Bassetlaw area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature, potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities. Problems can include collapses of mine entries and shallow coal mine workings, emissions of mine gases, incidents of spontaneous combustion, and the discharge of water from abandoned coal mines. These surface hazards can be found in any coal mining area, particularly where coal exists near to the surface, including existing residential areas. Within Bassetlaw there are approx 18 recorded mine entries and around 33 coal mining related hazards have been reported to The Coal Authority for emergency response. Mine entries may be located in built up areas, often under buildings where the owners and occupiers have no knowledge of their presence unless they have received a mining report during the property transaction. Mine entries can also be present in open space and areas of green infrastructure, potentially just under the surface of grassed areas. Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by Planning Authorities to ensure that site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards. Although mining legacy occurs as a result of mineral workings, it is important that new development recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. It is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable.	Mine entries and mining legacy will be considered as part of the site selection process. The Council will continue to work with the Coal Authority as part of the preparation of the next version of the Local Plan to ensure all relevant matters are taken into account.
DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	The Part 1 Local Plan does not seek to make site specific allocations for development save for two proposed strategic allocations for Garden Villages. Consider that Land to the South of Ordsall, Retford and Land to the south of Snape Lane, Harworth form strategically significant sites which are vital for the delivery of the District's housing and employment needs. The Plan should seek to allocate the above Sites, and other strategically significant Sites for the District.	Site allocations will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan. If appropriate this may include strategic sites.
DBLP138	I Carter	Bothamsall Parish Council	Will the plan support spiritual welfare of the community, if so, how?	Policy 23 supports the provision, retention and enhancement of community facilities which include places of worship.
DBLP176	D Harford	West Stockwith Parish Council	No major comments to make on this consultation	Comments welcome and noted.
DBLP179	W Lam	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	No detailed comments to make regarding the draft policies.	Comments welcome and noted.
DBLP182	D Bramley	Severn Trent Water Ltd	The Plan identifies significant number of development being required across the district, it is acknowledged that there will be a focus on Worksoop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes, identifies significant growth spread proportionally across the District. The Plan does not provide any identification of where these sites are to be located. Not possible to undertake detailed planning for growth related infrastructure requirements. Recommend that discussions are held as soon as developments are identified for development.	Site allocations will be set out in the next version of the Local Plan. The Council will work with Severn Trent to ensure that the site selection process is informed by detailed planning for growth requirements.
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	Should give appropriate weight to the roles performed by the area's soils. These should be valued as a finite multi-functional resource which underpins our wellbeing and prosperity. Decisions about development should take full account of the impact on soils, their intrinsic character and the sustainability of the many ecosystem services they deliver. The plan should safeguard the long term capability of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification) as a resource for the future in line with NPPF para 170. Expect the plan to address the impacts of air quality on the natural environment. In particular, it should address the traffic impacts associated with new development, particularly where this impacts on European sites and SSSIs. The SA and HRA should consider any detrimental impacts on the natural environment, and suggest appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures where applicable. Advise that one of the main issues in the plan and the SA/HRA are proposals which are likely to generate additional nitrogen emissions as a result of increased traffic generation, which can be damaging to the natural environment. The effects on local roads in the vicinity of any proposed development on nearby designated nature conservation sites (including increased traffic, construction of new roads, and upgrading of existing roads), and the impacts on vulnerable sites from air quality effects on the wider road network in the area (a greater distance away from the development) can be assessed using traffic projections and the 200m distance criterion followed by local Air Quality modelling where required. Consider that the designated sites at risk from local impacts are those within 200m of a road with increased traffic, which feature habitats that are vulnerable to nitrogen deposition/acidification. APIS provides a searchable database and information on pollutants and their impacts on habitats and species. Should identify relevant areas of tranquillity and provide appropriate policy protection to such areas as identified in NPPF para 100 and 180. Tranquillity is an important landscape attribute in certain areas e.g. in National Parks/AONBs, particularly where this is identified as a special quality. The CPRE have mapped areas of tranquillity which are available here and are a helpful source of evidence for the Local Plan and SEA/SA.	The next version of the Local Plan will include a range of development management policies. This will include a policy on environmental quality which will include criteria relating to soil quality, air quality. The SA and HRA will also ensure that any adverse impacts on the natural environment from Local Plan policies and/or site allocations are identified and mitigation/changes recommended. It is also expected that where this is not possible the SA/HRA will recommend avoidance.
DBLP187	T Swales		Express my overall support for the Plan. As a member of a rural community, the 2011 plan was written for townsfolk – countryfolk lived in polluting, unsustainable communities that would be allowed to die whilst concentrating investment and development in urban areas. The townsfolk did like to get out in the country now and then so no rural development thank you very much. The most perverse outcome of the 2011 Plan was what development did place on the countryside was often in totally inappropriate areas, eg flood zones or village greens. Have obviously listened to feedback from the rural community and incorporated it in the draft plan because it addresses all of these concerns and allows appropriate development whilst enhancing Bassetlaw and creating a district people will want to live in and enjoy – Well Done!	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP226	B Barnett	Retford Civic Society	Welcome the new plan and hope that it will be progressed speedily to adoption, followed by rapid production and adoption of a detailed plan allocating sites for development. The failure in recent years to agree a land allocation plan has been largely responsible for loss of control over where new house building takes place and this must not be repeated.	Support for progression of the Local Plan is noted.
DBLP245	P Bland		Support most of the policies as long as common sense is applied in considering applications.	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP258	R Walters	Broadgrove Planning and Development Ltd on behalf of MLN Land	National Planning Practice Guidance (paragraph 042) is clear that every 5 years from the date of adoption, a Local Plan must be reviewed to assess if the policies need updating in light of any changes to local circumstances and national policy. This is not currently reflected in the Plan and it is recommended that a commitment to review the Plan every 5 years should be captured within a Policy.	The commitment to review the content of the Local Plan every 5 years will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP259	R Worrall	Historic England	With particular reference to site allocations, draw attention to The Historic Environment in Local Plan - Good Practice Advice in Planning, Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment - Good Practice Advice in Planning, The Setting of Heritage Assets - Good Practice Advice in Planning and The Historic Environment and Site Allocations and Local Plans - Advice Note 3 which would be of use in developing your methodology for site assessment. Happy to discuss any methodology prior to work commencing.	Site allocations will be set out in the next version of the Local Plan. The Council will work with Historic England to ensure that the site selection process is informed appropriately by information on heritage assets.
DBLP266	R Walters	Broadgrove Planning and Development Ltd on behalf of MLN Land	National Planning Practice Guidance (paragraph 042) is clear that every 5 years from the date of adoption, a Local Plan must be reviewed to assess if the policies need updating in light of any changes to local circumstances and national policy. This is not currently reflected in the Plan and it is recommended that a commitment to review the Plan every 5 years should be captured within a Policy.	The commitment to review the content of the Local Plan every 5 years will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.

DBLP267	D Backhouse	Sustrans Bassetlaw Rangers	Welcome this stage of the draft Plan which has evidently been skillfully crafted, accounting for essential levels of residential and employment growth with associated community infrastructure, whilst promoting policies to safeguard and enhance the District's historical, landscape and environmental context	Support welcome and noted.
DBLP281	B Lange	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	The Local Plan does not have a consistent approach to sustainable travel. It supports sustainable travel by - requiring the implementation of a transport user hierarchy (with walking and cycling the highest priority, then public transport, and other motorized transport lowest priority) in Policy 12 1.d; - making reference to travel plans elsewhere; - requiring "necessary infrastructure, including green infrastructure, which ensures development is sustainable must be delivered" at 8.18 principles for development and growth]; -requiring good public transport access in Policies 9, 10 and 11; -requiring the prioritisation and promotion of access by walking, cycling and public transport in Policy 23 (Community Services and Facilities). Other policies do not include similar requirements without a justification for the difference. Policies 6 and 7 include requirements to meet highway standards and to provide parking on site but not even a reference to non-car access. Policy 8 only mentions highways, under 'sustainable infrastructure'. Policy 24 refers to a. physical infrastructure, including: i. transport improvements, including highways, public transport, provision for cyclists and pedestrians;" While public transport can require enhanced infrastructure, it is more important to secure funding for new or enhanced bus services and behaviour change programmes. The transport study identifies the need for changes in travel behaviour: "To help reduce traffic impacts a minimum target modal shift of 5% from car driving to sustainable modes is recommended to bring the average travel to work modal split across the district in line with the County average. To achieve this, new Local Plan development will need to deliver significantly higher modal shift away from car use and should be set appropriately higher targets. Sustainable travel infrastructure, services and initiatives will therefore need to be identified on a site-by-site basis to achieve this." (WYG Transport Study Update Jan 2019, Executive Summary). It is unclear whether Bassetlaw intend to reflect this in at a later stage, or if they do not, what the justification is for not doing so. The Plan does not include relevant policy wording, whereas road junction improvements are identified and CL1 is mentioned as the funding source. There is a mismatch in clarity and commitment between highway improvements and facilitating more sustainable travel.	The Local Plan needs to create the right conditions to ensure transport infrastructure can be efficient and effective in the District in future. New planning policies in the next version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan relating to transport will provide a clear approach for the consideration of transport infrastructure and sustainable travel in the future.
DBLP288	966527		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP298	975897		No support for any policy. Building more houses increases climate change and destroys vital countryside. The Plan will do the opposite of what you propose. The Council needs to concentrate on deprived areas, likes Workop and Harworth rather than build out of area. Rural locations need protection, not building on.	A balanced approach to future growth needs to be taken. Where possible the Council will ensure that regeneration and brownfield sites in existing towns are developed. However, it is not possible for all the Districts needs to be provided in these locations. Greenfield sites and rural areas will need to be used as well.
DBLP302	977408		No support for any policy. Living in a rural location would like to protect this as the benefits from just a health perspective we value. Our son for years suffered from asthma prior to moving here, he now does not have to use any medication and his quality of life has improved. More housing, worries us and the health impact this will have. Air pollution and the destruction of green space has a massive impact on health and well being. Moved here for the green open space to improve health and quality of life. Evidence states that an increase in housing impacts on health and wellbeing. Air pollution causes up to 36,000 early deaths per year in the UK. Public Health England states that air pollution is one of the UK's biggest killers. The Council's 2017 air pollution report states concerns about air pollution from the A1, in particular around Tuxford. Why is the Council proposing more housing in the areas next to the A1? The new villages will create an increase in traffic in the surrounding villages. The proposal will impact on residents in relation to an increase in rubbish, crime, traffic accidents, and air pollution.	The impact of new development upon the health and well-being of the community is important and will be considered through the site selection process, as well as the Sustainability Appraisal process.
DBLP305	986296		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP304	986292		No support	Comments noted.
DBLP306	986333		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP307	986349		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP309	986836		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP310	986858		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP312	987284		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP313	987594		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP316	987785		No support for any policy. This proposal clearly does not safeguard the transport infrastructure as it will destroy an airfield which is part of that infrastructure.	The Council has taken into consideration comments received and new evidence regarding the proposal for two new villages. New sites have been put forward for consideration as part of the consultation process. Given the availability of a more suitable site which can deliver a more sustainable new settlement and bring more benefits to the district, the Council has decided not to allocate land at Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery for new settlements.
DBLP318	987892		Support for all policies.	Support noted and welcome
DBLP320	988034		No support for any policies.	Comments noted.
DBLP321	988036		No support for the majority of the Plan.	Comments noted.
DBLP322	988044		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP324	988050		No support for any policy. I do not support large developments in this area. There are better places where houses could be built.	Comments noted.
DBLP325	988054		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP329	988063		No support for any policy. Climate Change will not be changed by Bassetlaw council! That is a matter for the world to face not a local councils wanting to take green land away and replace it with hardcore and housing!! Which will use more resources and won't be helping climate change!!! The land proposed is just a complete waste of naturally beauty and that of our local History!! By wanting to close such a wonderful private community and replace it with housing in my opinion isn't for the benefit of community nor that of the atmosphere as suggested above! This whole outfit will simply benefit those such as you the council and those developing the land also! So I strongly disagree to all the above as it's clearly a matter of community which we currently have or authority which we don't! Leave the airport as it is and endeavour to expand your pockets else where!!	Climate change mitigation and the support for the low carbon economy forms a central part to the revised Local Plan.
DBLP330	988064		I disagree with the plans that will detrimentally impact the airport.	Comments noted.
DBLP331	988083		No support for any policies in the Plan.	Comments noted.
DBLP332	988087		No support for any policies in the Plan.	Comments noted.
DBLP334	988094		No support for any policies in the Plan.	Comments noted.
DBLP335	988095		No support for any policies in the Plan.	Comments noted.
DBLP337	988176		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP338	988180		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP340	988204		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP341	988213		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP342	988214		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP345	988247		No support for any policy. use smaller areas already either disused or derelict land , the smaller the pockets used - the more the roads etc can cope - All Councils really need to learn from their own and others past mistakes - mass concrete surfaces more flooding	A balanced approach to future growth needs to be taken. Where possible the Council will ensure that regeneration and brownfield sites in existing towns are developed. However, it is not possible for all the Districts needs to be provided in these locations. Greenfield sites and rural areas will need to be used as well. The use of sustainable drainage required through new development can help areas that experience flooding.
DBLP347	988306		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP348	988323		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP353	988357		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP354	988363		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP355	988394		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP357	Scrooby Neighbourhood Action Plan (SNAP)		Disappointed that have not provided the ability for a Yes / No vote against the 5 major housing growth areas. Say "Yes" to some and "No" to others which would not necessarily give an overall Yes or No. Have many individual comments which are attached. However, instead of repeating the words of each page, paragraph, section, policy, etc., the document simply states the page number and point or policy reference number before our comments. Therefore please read the comments with the Strategic Plan document alongside	Comments noted.
DBLP358	988458		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP359	988461		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP361	988480		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.

DBLP366	988491		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP367	988492		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP368	988494		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP369	988496		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP370	988499		No support for any policy. You're killing off existing employment and infrastructure to create this. That doesn't make sense. Closing Gamston Airport will frustrate transport infrastructure rather than improve it.	Comments noted.
DBLP371	988500		I am unsure whether I support the proposed strategy or level of housing and employment development proposed.	Comments noted.
DBLP374	988517		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP377	988599		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP378	988625		No support for any policy. Cause you wont build enough schools, doctors surgeries and infrastructure. In fact you'll be long gone in 2035 to see the consequences.	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP379	988630		No support for any policy with the exception of the climate change policies and built and natural environment policies.	Comments noted.
DBLP380	988631		No support for any policy. The a1 and other major roads is already extremely busy, and although there is traffic calming in place, still really dangerous. Will it be able to cope with the extra traffic?	The Council works with infrastructure providers including Highways England and the Highways Authority to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development, including impacts upon the road network and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP381	988686		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP382	988706		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP386	988747		Bassetlaw should work with local people more especially landowners who seek to promoted land for development and stop listening to NIMBY's. East Markham need affordable homes for local people to be able to stay near their families. I know many people who have grown up children who cannot stay in the area as they have no chance of buying a £650,000 house and are not able to buy any more affordable homes as they are snapped up by a few local families who are buying to let all small properties. Equally older people want to stay in their village but have nowhere to but to downsize. In recent months two landowners in East Markham have tried to build such housing and been blocked by Bassetlaw's conservation officer who refused a work with either landowner to agree development. They have also said that they are willing to look at social housing but Bassetlaw have shown no interest in working with them. In contrast a number of fake threshing barns have been built and sold for £750,000 to people who have no ties to the community. A traditional working class farming village is being destroyed to be a yuppie playground with posh people making landowners lives a living hell, trespassing on their land, upsetting live stock and threatening them if the dare to apply to build on their own land.	Affordable housing is considered by Policy 3 and housing for older people by Policies 6 and 7.
DBLP388	988749		Should be more consultation with landowners who seek to promote land for development	The Council engage regularly with landowners through call for sites consultations to ensure an appropriate mix of sites are considered for development.
DBLP389	988774		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP389	988774		The Council should be aware of discussions ongoing in Westminster which are likely to remove from NPPG guidance the classification of airfields as brown field sites.	The Council is aware of Government discussions relating to airfields. The Council uses the current national planning guidance to inform the Local Plan. Should national guidance be changed then the emerging Local Plan will be amended accordingly.
DBLP390	988777		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP395	989195		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP396	989197		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP397	989207		No support for any policy	Comments noted.
DBLP398	989569		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP400	989956	Nottinghamshire County Council	NCC support all policies in the Plan.	Support for policies welcome and noted.
DBLP400	989956	Nottinghamshire County Council - Education	WORKSOP – Primary Gateford has 0.4ha of land, NCC to increase size of school to 315. Secondary – NCC will require contributions for 45 children based on £17763 per child. S106 for application 14/00431/OUT makes provision for 1.1 ha + optional 0.4ha for £40k, which will be paid for by the consent granted under application 14/00213 – Land at Gateford Common. RETFORD – NCC will require two additional primary class rooms, contributions to be based on build costs. HARWORTH & BIRCOTES – Existing NCC strategy remains the same. 5 FE (1050 places primary) 7 FE secondary (1470 place secondary) on Serlby Park Academy site. GAMSTON AIRPORT AND BEVERCOTES COLLIERY (NEW VILLAGE) – NCC will require 2ha of land for each development to future proof primary place provision. Further discussions are needed to identify the appropriate solution to deliver the secondary provision that will be required, including the possibility for a new school which, if required would need an area of land to be safeguarded within the Plan. NCC have based the following comments on the upper cap of potential dwellings: CLARBOROUGH & WELHAM – NCC will require an additional primary class room, contributions to be based on build costs. NCC will require contributions for secondary provision – at Retford Oaks High School. CUCKNEY/NORTON/WELLBECK/HOLBECK – no comments. ELKESLEY – NCC will require primary contributions – possible expansion of Elkesley or contributions to bigger provision at Gamston or Bevercotes proposals. MISSON – NCC will require primary (at Misson) and secondary (at ROHS) contributions. EAST MARKHAM – NCC will require builds costs for an additional primary classroom. There is potential for the secondary school to expand. HEADON CUM UPTON – There is currently primary capacity. NCC will require secondary contributions. SHIREOAKS – NCC will require secondary contributions (At Portland OGAT). TUXFORD the secondary school is circa 8 hectares and is supporting an 8 FE (1200 statutory aged (11-16) children) A site of this size could possibly support a statutory population of circa 1500 students – with associated 6th form. Currently, the published admission number of 240 places the school at near the upper limit of its net capacity. The school is an importer of students from Retford and Worksop therefore any growth in the first instance would lead to out of catchment applicants being unable to be accommodated. Tuxford – secondary. Consideration may need to be given to acquiring additional land to accommodate expansion at this school in the longer term. CARLTON IN LINDRICK – NCC will require 2 additional primary classrooms (at Langold PS), based on build costs. LANGOLD & HODSOCK – Primary currently has capacity. NCC will require secondary contributions for an extension to the existing school (at Portland OGAT). EVERTON – There is capacity for both primary and secondary school provision. MATTERSEY– There is capacity for both primary and secondary school provision. TRESWELL & COTTAM – NCC will require both primary and secondary contributions. MISTERTON – NCC will require an additional primary classroom (at Misterton), based on build costs and secondary (at ROHS) contributions. BYLTH – NCC will require build costs for a new primary extension and contributions to secondary provision. LOUND – no contributions required.	The Council will continue to work with NCC Education to ensure education facilities in the District are able to accommodate students generated by new development.

DBLP400	989956	Nottinghamshire County Council - HIA	The Plan sets out a positive vision in line with the Nottinghamshire Health & Wellbeing Strategy ambition for healthy and sustainable communities. Planners should always consider the protection and improvement of health, and the reduction of health inequalities, as fundamental principles when making planning decisions. It is recommended the Strategic Plan makes a clear reference to the Nottinghamshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and 2018 Bassetlaw District Health profile. There are recommendations in relation to 10 HIA domains. 1. Housing quality and design: An updated reference to 2018 Bassetlaw Health Profile is required. 2. Access to healthcare services and other social infrastructure: Encourage housing developers to sign up to the BRE Home Quality Mark (HQM) 3. Air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity: Consider the principles for natural and sustainable environments to include a policy on air quality aligned with the Nottinghamshire Air Quality Strategy which is being refreshed for publication. 4. Accessibility and active transport: Consider the principles of Active Design 2; 5. Crime reduction and community safety: Recommendations re lighting and walk way design - to enhance connectivity with safe and efficient infrastructure: enhancing street connectivity via provision of walking and cycling infrastructure and improving access to public transportation 6. Access to healthy food: This could do with strengthening to reflect The TCPA six Healthy Weight Environment elements and the Food Environment Priority within the Nottinghamshire Health & Wellbeing Strategy 2018-2022. 7. Access to work and training: Consider, as part of this policy, prioritising the creation of supported employment opportunities for people with mental illness and/or learning disabilities, and that priority be given to care leavers as part of Nottinghamshire's role as a corporate parent for this group. 8. Social cohesion and lifetime neighbourhoods: Consider, as part of this policy, prioritising the creation of supported employment opportunities for people with mental illness and/or learning disabilities, and that priority be given to care leavers as part of Nottinghamshire's role as a corporate parent for this group. 9. Climate change: The Council could encourage housing developers to sign up to the BRE Home Quality Mark (HQM) which is a voluntary sustainability standard for new homes 10. Health inequalities: This section could do with strengthening with clearer referencing to health inequalities for example Section 2 Bassetlaw in Context: Geography. The completed Rapid HIA tool attached as a table.	Health and wellbeing is an important element of the Local Plan. References to the Health and Wellbeing Strategy, Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and Health Profile will be added to the Local Plan. The recommendations of the HIA will be reflected in the next version of the Local Plan to provide better consistency with the HIA.
DBLP400	989956	Nottinghamshire County Council - Minerals and Waste	The County Council is the Minerals Authority, Bassetlaw as a district council also play a key role in safeguarding minerals. Minerals are a finite resource and can only be worked where they are found - safeguarding minerals is important to ensure a steady and adequate supply to meet future demand. As per NPPF paragraph 203 (2018), the NCC safeguards these minerals by defining a Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Area (MSA/MCA). To further ensure the safeguarding of minerals, the local district councils should consider the MSA/MCA and the potential effects allocations made in their local plan may have on the Local Minerals Plan. The MSA/MCA should also be shown on the districts Local Plan policies map (PPG paragraph 5, 2014).	The Council will ensure that the MSA/MCA are considered as part of the site selection process for the site allocations. The MSA/MCA will be shown on the draft Policies Map.
DBLP400	989956	Nottinghamshire County Council - Highways	There are no specific transport policies or guidance re transport assessment requirements which are strongly recommended.	The next version of the Local Plan will include policies relating to transport infrastructure and sustainable travel.
DBLP406	990063		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP407	990068		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP408	990070		No support for any policy. We seem to have extra surplus housings currently. Why put strain on a system struggling to cope now. I see no positives to the plan, only negatives.	Comments noted.
DBLP409	990071		Do not support any policy apart from safeguarding infrastructure.	Comments noted.
DBLP412	990081		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP413	990083		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP414	990128		No support for any policy.	Comments noted.
DBLP417	990255		No support for any policy. I cannot support any plan that closes an important airfield. As a private pilot I see airfields being closed in many areas. They should be reclassified as green field sites. They are becoming an ever more important facility which once lost cannot be replaced.	Comments noted.
DBLP497	990938		NHS - the nhs is widely struggling with cuts, low/no staff, departments being shut, Worksoop no longer have a children's ward meaning having to drive to Doncaster taking up to an hour putting the lives of children at risk so show me where the money's coming from and where the staff are coming from to put in a building and call it a "doctors surgery" Education - only yesterday on the 8/4/19, good morning Britain had a councillor on regarding school cuts, to which schools up and down the country cannot event afford stationary for the children or even too rolls, plus again they're short staffed. Eaton bridge, every summer we have at least 100 kids down playing in the river, running across the bridge to jump in the water, the speed of which cars go through the village and then with the added influx of cars coming from your "bassetlawplan", one day a child is going to get killed when playing with their friends! We have enough cars already to which nothing is being done about it. We have asked for speed cameras, speed awareness signs to which yes one was put up but lasted less than a month before some unknown reason it was taken down. The airfield - it is a busy airfield, why take people's jobs away from them to put housing for people, where there is no jobs for them to afford these houses?! Car parking - as noted previously, there are no car parks at the train station, or the Worksoop side of Retford, the area is gridlocked every day between 8-10 and 4-6/7.	The Council works with infrastructure providers to ensure that all new development sites can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. Where this is not possible the Council will see whether use of developer contributions can help mitigate impacts identified. Until development sites are identified it is not possible to determine the infrastructure needs of future development and when the infrastructure is likely to be required. These will be identified in the next version of the Local Plan.
DBLP508	990955		One assumes that any objections are pointless at this stage, while the plan answers many questions and fixes symptoms of a problem, it does not solve the problem and causes many more problems than it resolves. It is a demonstration of bassetlaw council looking for easy options rather than attempting to provide more complicated to achieve solutions for the improvement of bassetlaw residents and business	Comments noted.
DBLP521	991176		The only people to profit from these proposals would be the builders.	Comments noted.
Consultation				
DBLP31	Cllr J Ogle		Whilst thanking BDC for including Gamston in the consultation at the Gamston School this was far too late. Running the evening on the 6th March, when the close is the 9th March does not allow anyone sufficient time to prepare an efficient response, and they are the most effected by the New Town proposals other than Bothamsall who 4 miles away did not have a mobile consultation opportunity. The consultation in general was not adequately publicised, and a longer consultation would have been appreciated. What was the rush?	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP33	P Holmes		More avenues should be explored for letting people know about the plans for Retford. Most of my neighbours do not have access to the Internet so didn't know that the event was taking place, nor do they purchase the Retford Times.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP132	M Green		The consultation period for this whole process seems to have been extremely short - is this deliberate? Obviously with such a small number of houses in Gamston petitioning would be of little influence, a fact which I am sure the District Council will no doubt use to defend their decisions! It is NOT a lack of opposition, it is simply not a heavily populated area - something its inhabitants wish it to remain!!!	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP146	L Gay		You have commissioned 2,489 pages of information, to ensure due diligence over every and any point, but many of the residents of Gamston had known nothing about it until a few days previously. Three years of study and work, tens of thousands of pounds spent yet the people who would be impacted heavily by one of the suggestions knew nothing. Its virtually unreadable by the layman. It is on the Bassetlaw website but how were people supposed to know about it unless they are devotees of Local Government or ardent social media followers? Your actions have disenfranchised many the chance to read and comment on everything before the cut off date. There is a feeling it is a done deal.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP206	Mr K. Ashford & Miss K Andrews		A 5-day consultation time was woefully inadequate; it would leave us to suspect that you are not interested in our concerns or feedback! After Speaking to several neighbours in Gamston, not everyone had been notified of the plans for the airport or the meeting on the 5th, can you please tell me how many residents of Gamston and Elkesley were actually notified of the plans and the meeting held at Gamston School on 05/03/2019?	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP230	D Argent-Cook		The inclusion of Gamston in the consultation at the Gamston School on the evening of Tuesday 5th March, just 5 days before this consultation was to Close was far too late and did not allow anyone sufficient time to put together a comprehensive reply. The consultation in general was not adequately publicised, and a longer consultation would have been appreciated.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.

DBLP232	N Oldbury	Elkesley Parish Council	Does not support this plan in its current form and are unanimous in their opinion that the consultation has been woefully inadequate. The Parish Council were given less than three days' notice of the consultation event in the village, hence the vast majority of villagers were unaware it was taking place. The expectation by BDC staff was that the Parish Council would advertise it on their behalf and at such short notice only people who follow Facebook or our web site would have been informed, this amounts to less than 10% of the local population. The number of comments received will be significantly lower than normal and not a true representation of villagers' and can't be classed as full consultation with the local population. The cost cutting exercise in consultation that has taken place needs to be redone, in a manner that targets all of BDC electorate and not just the few who participate in social media or the internet.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP233	K Davis		The way the consultations were carried out was incredibly unfair, Gamston wasn't even mentioned in places to view the plan and they would be the most effected, and had the shortest period of time in which to object.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP246	K Evans		The Council should have been 'braver' in its approach to consultation. Considering the 2 proposed Garden Villages will be within 2.2km it would have been appropriate to begin the consultation in the village. The late arrival of our consultation event and the early close date for comments coupled with the lack of response (from council employees) to basic questions during the consultation - the plan and the approach is heavily flawed. Would like to have had more than 3 days to pull together my response, but unfortunately this was not possible. Was the consultation at Gamston 'over looked' or purposefully left until the final few days so our communities feedback would be limited?? Maybe it was hoped no one would attend and 'Garden Village' plans could be pushed through without interruption? Why when the introduction of the plan states the public consultation will begin in LATE 2019 was it pushed forward to January? What was the rush? Why were the officers unable to answer specific questions relating to the plan? Especially as I was informed after the event at least one of them was integral to the construction of the plan? Why did they deny there had been other potential locations looked at for garden villages? Why is the Plan reactive instead of proactive? Was told this was addressing issues 'for today' and didn't seek to plan for the future!	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP250	A Wilson	Gamston with West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council	Very concerned that the consultation process resulted in the villages that will be greatly affected by the plans, were those last to be included in the opportunity to view the plans in detail and present their concerns to council representatives. The consultation has relied on the Parish councillors organising appropriate forums for discussion and this has been done in a very limited time span. A further concern is the lack of engagement with residents who would be affected by this development due to a range of issues that include age and access to literature and the limited forums.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP257	J Worthington		This development will have a massive impact on the local residents and there has been little publicity regarding the proposed developments on our doorstep. The first public consultation came before anything had been mentioned in local publications and even then the implications for the villages were not highlighted to the residents. Gamston does not have a Neighbourhood Plan and was not aware that we needed and could have developed one. The process has not been inclusive as not everyone has access to the Internet and the information at the consultations has been limited (not all documents were available for viewing) and verbally contradictory. A last minute consultation was provided at Gamston school with leaflets advertising it delivered only two days before, so not everyone would be able to attend and those who did, only had a few days to digest the information and comment on before the closing date. The Bassetlaw Plan and associated documents available on line are very long-winded, repetitive and difficult to read! Believe that if these garden villages are to go ahead, it is because the rural settlements surrounding them are so small and there are fewer people to object, than if they were to be built closer to an existing town.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP261	A Argent-Cook	On behalf of All Saints Parochial Church Council, Eaton and Gamston	The inclusion of Gamston in the consultation on the evening of Tuesday 5th March, just 5 days before this consultation was to Close was far too late and did not allow anyone sufficient time to put together a comprehensive reply. The consultation was not adequately publicised, and a longer consultation would have been appreciated.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP263	L Vernon		The consultation process was not sufficiently robust or inclusive. The planned consultation events were mainly advertised online on the council's website and via social media. The demographics of Eaton and Gamston show that a significant proportion of residents are elderly and most do not have access to a PC. A significant proportion of Eaton residents also have English as a second language, but documents have not been translated. Disappointed that the consultation event at Gamston School was only added in the planned events towards the end of the process, meaning that those most affected by the plans have only had the time from the evening of the 5th March to the submission deadline on the 10th to formulate their response.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP264	R Vernon		Object to draft plan for the development of the Gamston airfield site for housing. Grateful for the opportunity to discuss proposals with the planning officers in detail at the consultation event at Gamston School. Questions either weren't fully answered or were met with a defensive attitude. Giving 10th March as the closing date for objections when the event was Tuesday 5th March does not allow sufficient time to give a detailed and considered response.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP265	S Chandler		While a consultation meeting was finally added 5 days before the closing date of this stage of the consultation, for the people of the Gamston, West Drayton and Eaton Parish it has not given those who live nearest to one of the potential development sites sufficient time to comment on it and therefore not given a true consultation to the local residents especially those with no electronic method of communicating.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP268	G Hunt		There has been a lack of timely consultation with those most likely to be affected by this proposal. As a resident of Gamston, found out about these proposals from a friend in Retford. It was several weeks after this that any information was received by Gamston residents. No meeting was originally planned in Gamston. The meeting that was subsequently arranged, at the request of the Parish Council, took place on Tuesday 5th March, giving residents less than a week to respond to the plan before consultation ends. The attitude of some of the officers attending the event was disappointing. The event was publicised to be held from 5-8pm, yet at 7.40pm officers had begun to tidy away. Some residents were spoken to in a rude manner.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP275	J Howe		The residents of Gamston were not informed properly and that the consultation meeting that took place on 5th March did not give the residents sufficient time to respond.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP276	S and Z Venables		Disappointed that a Consultation wasn't planned for the village of Gamston until the very last minute despite those residents being the most affected by these plans.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.

DBLP279	S Roberson	Radiola Aerospace Europe Ltd	I alongside my employees at Radiola located at the airport in question, have not been contacted, neither have any other airport business employees. There has been no official representation of anything at the airport site in relation to this plan. A lot of secrecy has surrounded the plan. Untrue statements have been made by representatives of the airport management in support of the Garden village plan. Wonder how deep the concern is about the "economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy," or the need for a national network of GA fields.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP284	N Ward	Doncaster Council	The Council was not informed about the Local Plan consultation in line with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) England Regulations 2012. It is imperative that we are consulted as part of the Localism Act 2011 (through the inclusion of Section 33A into the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) for Duty to Cooperate purposes. It is also necessary that Tickhill Town Council and Bawtry Town Council are additionally consulted. Please ensure that we are all included on your Local Plan consultation database.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP405	990062		The advertising of the consultation events has been very poor, little notice was given to Parishes and an expectation assumed that they would advertise it within their areas. Whilst the cost of letter dropping Bassetlaw may be prohibitive it would not have cost much to produce large posters to be displayed in shops and bus stops. The questions on this form are very guided - eg Do you support the proposed policies that seek to address climate change? No I dont support the BDC policies but I do support the principle of addressing climate change. It would have helped if the questions had identified the relevant sections of the Plan (different terminology is used in the questions as against the plan)	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP444	990802		Ensure that further consultation events involve local people who are likely to be affected immediately – A Gamston session was requested by the local Parish Council and only took place 5 days before the end of the consultation period. As a local Parish Councilor I witnessed a large number of local people at out meeting on 7 March and they were rather disgruntled with the lack of information about these developments.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP446	990814		This consultation has been very poorly advertised. It came to Headon Village Hall and nobody in the village knew anything about it, so the chance to explain the plan to residents was largely missed.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP450	990836		This consultation form appears to have been either written by someone who has absolutely no knowledge and experience of creating a neutral and unbiased questionnaire, or someone who has lots but has a predetermined picture of the results they want to receive...incredibly disappointed in the way that BDC has approached this entire situation.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP457	990847		The consultation event only being arranged at Gamston School as a last minute after thought just 5 days before consultation submissions were due is inexcusable. At the consultation event reference was made to a feasibility study of the 6 possible sites for the garden villages, which is published but no reference made to in the draft plan and no opportunity for consultation	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP479	990910		The inclusion of Gamston in the consultation at the Gamston School on the evening of Tuesday 5th March, just 5 days before this consultation was to Close was far too late and did not allow anyone sufficient time to put together a comprehensive reply. The consultation in general was not adequately publicised, and a longer consultation would have been appreciated.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP518	991172		It gave very little notice at the beginning of the consultation so much so that large swathes of the local residents did not know about it.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP522	991178		There was very little publicity! the acoustics in the town hall were poor at best then the following roadshows appeared to have very little regard for the villages that were affected most by the plan. Elkesley was the first meeting, where hardly anybody knew about and then right at the end there was a meeting at Gamston School which you could argue is the most affected parish and the residents of Gamston, Eaton and west Drayton were only left with 3 days in which to submit their comments.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP531	991221		Consultation has been poorly delivered, especially for people near the proposed new villages. Elkesley where given little notice of their event with it taking place so early. on the other hand Bothamsall had no event and Gamston only had it's event put on at last minute on 5th March with 95 attendees, which I believe was higher than any other advertised event in the short consultation period. This left only 5 days to put comments in	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP532	Gareth Evans		As a resident of Gamston Village I feel Bassetlaw Council should have been 'braver' in its approach to consultation of the Bassetlaw Plan. Considering the 2 proposed Garden Villages will both be within 2.2km of us it would have been appropriate to begin the consultation process with in our village. I feel the whole plan and the approach Bassetlaw has taken to it is heavily flawed. I would like to have had more than 1 day to pull together my response to the Garden Village proposals, but unfortunately due to the inadequately thought through consultation process and work commitments this was not possible. Was the consultation at Gamston 'over looked' or purposefully left until the final few days so our communities feedback would be limited?? I was unaware of the consultation events and working away when the date was added to Gamston – this left inadequate time to respond fully. Maybe it was hoped no one would attend and 'Garden Village' plans could be pushed through without interruption? Why when the introduction of the plan states the public consultation will begin in LATE 2019 was it pushed forward to January? What was the rush?	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.
DBLP539	991241		Insufficient time was given to the residence of Gamston to feedback after the meeting on Wednesday.	The Council undertook a detailed consultation roadshow throughout the consultation period which was an 8-week period which is longer than the statutory recommendation of 6 weeks. A large number of events were held across the District and this was heavily publicised in the media, local papers, the Council's website, posters and through the distribution of flyers to local communities via parish council or Neighbourhood Plan groups. Further events were added where necessary.

Sustainability Appraisal

DBLP136	I Gilbert	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Howard (Retford) Ltd	<p>It is necessary for the SA to appraise reasonable alternatives for the Local Plan to properly understand the implications of the Council's proposed housing requirement. Do not consider that such an assessment has been adequately undertaken. Paragraph 4.41 of the SA notes that it has taken into account the SMOAN, updated ONS household projections and an updated evidence base, including a draft EDNA. It considers the following development options: • Option 1: Government's standardised OAN figure – 306 dpa • Option 2: SHMA-based OAN – 374 dpa • Option 3: Overall housing requirement to support economic growth based on the Oxford Economics midpoint scenario (EDNA-based) – 390 dpa • Option 4: EDNA-based higher requirement to support economic growth based on the Experian midpoint scenario – 493 dpa Para 4.42 of the SA notes the revised set of four housing target options has been appraised. Note that the Interim SA report comments how the options would contribute to HMA-wide OAN and city region employment ambitions. Para 4.42 stresses that these have not been considered because it was considered that up to date figures for wider needs were not available at the time of assessment and the Council no longer considers the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan figure (636 dpa) to be a reasonable alternative, based on the updated evidence available. This is an inadequate assessment of alternative options - It is vital for the SA to consider the sustainability implications for the delivery of an ambition Local Plan, including a scenario where the employment land it has permitted comes forward (with the housing growth to support it) and at least consider a level of growth that supports the City Region for which it forms part of the LEP. It is not clear why an increased figure of 636dpa has no longer been considered as a reasonable alternative. The assessment provides an oversimplified and misleading representation of the development options available. The benefits of the options in terms of their housing contribution have been capped once they have exceeded the minimum expectation of the SMOAN. This is not an acceptable assessment of sustainability where planning guidance notes that sustainability of the plan can be enhanced through the provision of additional supply of housing; the Council has sought to boost the supply of housing above the minimum requirements of the SMOAN to increase the sustainability of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Council is satisfied that the Sustainability Appraisal is robust and covers all reasonable alternatives. Housing and Economic Needs Assessment Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 2a-002-20190220) indicates that the standard method should be followed when assessing housing need. The Standard Method sets out a formula to assess the minimum housing requirement for each local authority area. It then goes on to consider when it may be appropriate to plan for a higher housing need figure than the standard method calculation using the formula. There are a number of circumstances where it may be appropriate to increase the housing requirement figure. This may be where an LPA is seeking to deliver economic growth or where unmet need from neighbouring authorities has been agreed in a statement of common ground. The housing requirement for Bassetlaw using the Standard Method equates to 306 dwellings per annum. The Bassetlaw EDNA includes an assessment of housing need based on the need to deliver enough development to support economic growth. This uses the 306 dpa as a starting point. The EDNA concludes that, to support economic growth, 390 dwellings per annum are required to be delivered. Bassetlaw is not in the same housing market area as Sheffield and it does not adjoin Sheffield's boundary. The Council's have not entered into an agreement regarding the delivery of Sheffield's development needs. The Council is seeking to deliver a significant amount of housing over and above the housing requirement, sufficient to meet the district's needs beyond 2037.</p>
DBLP143	George Breed	Persimmon Homes & Charles Church	<p>Strategic policies should provide a clear strategy to bring sufficient land forward at a sufficient rate to address housing needs over the plan period by planning for and allocating sufficient sites to deliver strategic priorities. Table 6 states 3949 homes from the OAN target 6630 homes have planning permission or are allocated in Neighbourhood Plans. Based on the proposed OAN figure 6630, only 2681 homes remain to be allocated through the site allocation process. The SA sets out the methodology looking at the likely social, environmental and economic effects of proposed Local Plan policies and proposals to maximise sustainable development. The assessment suggests that significant growth in rural settlements and a lower growth for Worksop and Retford will reduce large scale development on Greenfield sites. The reality is rural settlement growth is as likely to use Greenfield land as urban extensions. An important question is whether the sustainable outcome from adopting a differentiated rural growth pattern is greater than pursuing large scale urban extensions. Don't consider the SA provides sufficient evidence to suggest why a higher apportionment of rural development is sustainable. Bassetlaw is served by three towns; the Largest Worksop (41,000 population); Retford (22,000 population) and Harworth (7800 population). The remainder of the District is served by circa 40 or so rural villages & hamlets. The draft Local Plan apportion: Worksop (24%) 1600 homes; Retford (13%) 853 homes; Harworth (21%) 1400 homes; New villages (15%) 1000 homes; Rural settlements (27%) 1777 homes. The rationale in the SA behind the spatial distribution of housing numbers is questionable. Table 4.2 scores the 5 available spatial approaches against 14 sustainable objectives and provides a brief overview stating whether an approach is considered to provide a positive or negative impact. Unfortunately the level of detail provided to justify positive or negative outcomes lacks the necessary detail to allow a full appreciation of the Council's rationale. Without this detail unable to determine whether the scoring in Table 4.2 is accurate, by extension whether a hybrid or parallel strategy is justified.</p>	<p>Disagree. The SA finds that this option will reduce the intensity of effects in one location, thereby minimising the effects on the landscape. As identified by the SA, the distribution of development will likely provide a positive effect in relation to cultural heritage, landscape and land use as development is likely to be fairly small-scale, thereby minimising the intensity of any effects on the landscape, and any cultural assets, as well as the amount of greenfield land which is to be developed in any one location. It is essential that both urban and rural bassetlaw remain sustainable by supporting services and businesses in all areas of the district. It should be acknowledged that there are some large businesses/organisations in the rural areas (e.g. Rampton Hospital which employs approximately 2000 people). There is a need to maintain a workforce to sustain economic growth both in the urban and rural areas of Bassetlaw.</p>
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	<p>Note the Sustainability Appraisal follows an appropriate methodology. Note the significant positive effects on biodiversity from strategic objectives 5 to 10.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>
DBLP221	B Weedall	Gladman Developments	<p>Should ensure that the results of the SA process conducted through the review clearly justify any policy choices that are ultimately made, including the proposed site allocations (or any decision not to allocate sites) when considered against 'all reasonable alternatives'. In meeting the development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, the Council's decision making, and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.</p>	<p>Agree. Thank you for your comments</p>
DBLP223	P Stone	Stone Planning Services on behalf of the Charterpoint Group	<p>Paragraph 4.5 is very much focussed on planned growth commensurate to settlement size with a growth cap of 20%. References are made to 'new homes' with no reference to employment.</p>	<p>Whilst paragraph 4.5 does not mention employment, it has been assessed - see the assessment of option 7 in table 4.1 on page 49.</p>
Evidence Base				
DBLP186	L Alvey	Natural England	<p>Welcomes the Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report. Agree with the conclusion of no Likely Significant Effect on Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC, Hatfield Moor SAC, Thorne Moor SAC and Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA. Pleased to note that the screening report follows Natural England's prescribed precautionary approach for the Sherwood Forest possible potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA). The report shows that the two proposed Garden Villages (Bevercotes and Gamston) fall within the 5km buffer area for the Important Bird Area (IBA) as identified by the RSPB. Based on the location of the garden villages the report concludes that Likely Significant Effects on the Sherwood ppSPA cannot be ruled out and that further environmental assessment (appropriate assessment) will be undertaken in the second round of consultation on the Bassetlaw Local Plan. Happy to advice further.</p>	<p>An Appropriate Assessment will be undertaken to inform the next version of the Local Plan. The Council will engage Natural England to ensure that the approach taken is appropriate.</p>
DBLP191	K Miller	National Trust	<p>Concerned that the EDNA Appendix 1 Bassetlaw Site Assessments includes a large area of land off the A57 with a recommendation that some of the site should be identified for employment use (site 13. Land off A57, 188.5ha). This is a large area of greenfield land that maintains open countryside between Worksop and the A1. The gradual sprawl of land uses with an industrial character to the south and east of Worksop already has a significant impact on the character of the area. The land is located in Natural England's National Character Area 49: Sherwood. The area profile summary includes the following description: "The oak and birch wood pasture in the heartland of Sherwood Forest and more recent pine plantations, contribute strongly to the sense of place. Large estate parklands, heathland, open arable land and a strong mining heritage also characterise the area." The Statement of Environmental Opportunity for Sherwood includes: SE01: Protect, enhance and promote Sherwood as a landscape of international environmental and cultural significance by securing and expanding the iconic mosaic of woods, heaths and parklands, and enhancing sustainable recreation and cultural opportunities. The document also refers to recent changes and trends including: 'marked dispersed development between Ollerton, East Retford and Worksop'. Further development along the A57 corridor will contribute to the cumulative erosion of the Sherwood character area. Any proposed site allocation in this area should, as a minimum, secure protection in perpetuity of the band of woodland in the south of the site which is identified as a Local Wildlife Site.</p>	<p>The National Trust's comments will be used to inform the approach to site selection for employment use.</p>

DBLP270	D Troop		<p>Object to the equal weighting of Primary Schools to GP Surgery, Convenience Retail and Post Office services. There is no evidence to show that primary school provision in Bassetlaw has been volatile historically, or that it is likely to be so in the future. Section 4 states that the differentiation between rural settlements where growth is/ isn't supported, is based on settlement size/impact of development as opposed to on service provision and accordingly, fig 2 identifies 30 rural settlements where growth would not be supported. The subsequent list (fig 3) identifies 73 rural settlements where growth would be supported. Of these, less than 30 villages can offer primary school provision meaning that for in excess of 40 villages, travel to another settlement will be necessary. To rank villages without primary school provision as equal in development capability/sustainability terms to those who have, does not take into account the traffic congestion that occurs when children are driven to school. This consultation document may quote maximum acceptable journey times to school but it does not take into account the impact in health or infrastructure terms, upon the "receiving" settlement. NPPF PARA 84: Planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable (for example by improving the scope for access on foot, by cycling or by public transport). The use of previously developed land, and sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements, should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist. NPPF PARA 78: To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. The 40+ rural villages identified to receive 20% growth in Bassetlaw and which do NOT retain a primary school, will not therefore, be supporting the primary school service in their village (NPPF para 78). They will be provoking an unacceptable impact on local roads (NPPF para 84) in the villages where primary school provision is already in situ. The draft LP identifies that traffic accidents in Bassetlaw are above the national average and for many villagers with small children, walking/cycling/public transport to Another settlement for school, will not be an option. The fall-back position, as ever, will be the car. The Rural Settlement Study fails to reference Everton with a convenience store. The Yurt sells milk, eggs, butter bread and other store cupboard items</p>	The Rural Settlement Study has been reviewed which has informed the revised spatial strategy, growth distribution and Local Plan.
DBLP270	D Troop		<p>In not differentiating between rural settlements with/without primary school provision, the LPA is ignoring sustainability policies (climate change, healthy infrastructure, road safety) in the draft Plan and in the NPPF. The Appendix 6 capped growth figure of 20% is too high for villages without a primary school and should be reduced to the 10% requirement. The cumulative reduction arising from this % cut, should be shared equally between villages that DO retain a primary school. The 2019 consultation document puts forward that the review of the Functional Cluster model was instigated by 2016 consultation comments that: a. Costhorpe, Grove, Mattersey Thorpe and Misson had not been identified within a cluster b. Other clusters were not representative of reality c. Clusters might "merge" and lose distinctiveness All the above elements are easily resolved either through – identifying a relevant cluster; identifying that a cluster is not necessary for that particular settlement; verifying that settlement "merge" will be prohibited by policies etc etc.....The more likely reason for the change in spatial strategy away from Rural Service Centres and their linked "functional cluster" is the reflection of Neighbourhood Planning experiences found on page 4. Whilst some Neighbourhood plan groups may have: "sought to plan positively to respond to identified housing need in their respective areas"and been frustrated by their inability to do so because they were not a Rural Service Centre or part of a functional cluster; this has not been the case with the Everton Neighbourhood Plan. In fact, during Examination, the Examiner downgraded the level of development achievable via allocations from the purported 49 units to a mere 16. Neighbourhood Planning in Bassetlaw has been used as a development "blocking" tool. Evidence from the Everton Neighbourhood Plan Hearing shows that the Examiner agreed with our assessment. The Steering Group, in conjunction with the LPA, were overstating the number of units that would come forward from compromised sites and placing a block on other sites coming forward thereafter (via highly dubious site assessments). Following 11 made Neighbourhood Plans (NP) in the District, Everton NP is the first to have been granted a Hearing. It has taken three years of consultation responses, challenges, complaints against the NP Steering Group Chair, complaints against the Parish Council, complaints against the Neighbourhood Planner, letters to the Council Solicitor and the sufferance of a smear campaign. Based on our experience, it is entirely likely that some or all of the 11 Neighbourhood Plans in the District will have overstated the development potential of their allocated sites. Far from being concerned that villages were frustrated by their inability to deliver growth (pg4), prior to the Everton NP Hearing, Neighbourhood Planners will have realised the ease with which growth could be limited through the NP process. Thus meaning that growth could be "awarded" to a higher number of (previously unsuitable) settlements lacking in services. The LPA's reasoning for eradicating Rural Service Centres and awarding equal growth to 73 rural settlements across the district is not believed. At 12.1 (pg87) reminded that the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan 2016 put forward the possibility of developing a garden village. At the time, my consultation response stated that this was not necessary as there was enough land availability amongst existing villages to satisfy growth requirements. Others have put forward this view and it has been ignored DESPITE the LAA confirming more than adequate availability of land adjacent to settlement boundaries in the district. Pg 87 describes the options appraisal work undertaken to identify sites for garden village delivery. No cost benefit analysis is provided in terms of allocating those sites, adjacent to the A1, as employment sites. No cost benefit analysis is provided in terms of utilising the 2017 LAA finding to deliver the housing required amongst existing settlements. The LPA are satisfied that they have had viable sites put forward and they have been confident that they could limit growth in rural settlements via the NP process. At 8.19 the 2019 draft LP is proposing 1777 units across 73 settlements 2018-2035 representing an average of 24 units per settlement over 18 years (1.35 houses per annum). If this was doubled to 2.7 units per annum over the 18 year period, it is still pitiful (average) growth for Rural Service Centres. The Garden Village Proposal should be dropped and the growth identified through that mechanism, awarded to existing rural settlements.</p>	The Rural Settlement Study has been reviewed which has informed the revised spatial strategy, growth distribution and Local Plan.