

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
1190067	Resident	Principles are well meant but limiting. New housing will go in places accessible by sustainable and public transport with a promise to protect important green spaces. This is at odds with ST21 site HS7 proposal to relocate Leaffield and Denman allotments	The Council is now proposing to remove Site HS7 Leaffield Allotments from the site allocations. It will remain as an allotment site.
REF010	Resident	The problem (puzzle might be a better word) is that predicting population and economic growth is incredibly difficult. My worry is that Bassetlaw is over optimistic and that has led to projections for way too much housing development and, crucially, allowing housing to be developed without first putting in place adequate infrastructure to support it. Now really important for housing development to begin in places with no or little impact on other residents. In Retford, many people have been affected by unsympathetic building sites. More sympathetic North Road site in Retford is very important. That site should be developed before any further demands are placed on the town or villages. All Retford needs is the excellent Garden Villages, which could be wonderful, and the North Road development. Have an interest in villages and some will want to expand considerably. See my comments about the small village of Lound, where your consultation reads like a set of demands at a time when local people have very recently undertaken 4 years of work to write a Neighbourhood Plan. The real danger is that imposed, rigid targets for housing development without prior visible changes in transport, shops or appreciation of local residents' work to help planning through existing Village Neighborhood Plans will lead residents to become very cynical about local government.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. Policy ST1 has been updated to reflect comments received from the previous consultation in January. This has led to a change to the proposed percentage requirement and to the list of eligible Small Rural Settlements. The updated Rural Settlement Paper provides a narrative to the evolution of the strategy for rural Bassetlaw since 2016 and how the percentage requirements were derived and changed overtime.
REF023	Water Management Consortium	The Board is primarily concerned with the rate of flow and volume of water to our network of maintained watercourses; supports the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and recommends that SUDS are incorporated into all developments where feasible. SUDS should be designed to mimic the pre development 'greenfield' surface water regime and must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. Recommend including in this section that drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites. Bassetlaw is served by two Internal Drainage Boards. Below is information regarding Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board and Isle of Axholme & North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board's operations and responsibilities which may be useful to include as an overview of the Boards' activities.	The Council will ensure that the evidence is updated accordingly.
REF029	Torworth Parish Council	Within the Spatial Strategy Document (Jan 2020) Torworth has been incorrectly identified as having a Village Hall – which therefore determines it as being classed as a small rural settlement. Don't have one, or any of the other facilities that would class it as being a small rural settlement. How can this be corrected ?	The Spatial Strategy Background Paper will be updated accordingly.
REF089	NEDDC	Offer support, in principle, for Bassetlaw's strategy to deliver sustainable development and accommodate all its development needs within its own boundaries. Require further clarification in relation to the Draft Plan's housing and employment land targets, before could recommend that this Council signs up to any cross-boundary agreement on these matters.	The Council has followed national Planning Practice Guidance: Housing and economic development needs assessment in determining the requirement for Bassetlaw. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two.
REF132	CODA Planning	Planning permission for development have been subsequently built out or are under construction; • emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan residential, employment and mixed-use allocations which are considered physically related to the settlement; and • areas of land which are physically related to the settlement, are defined by a strong physical boundary, and are capable of being developed without compromising: i. residential amenity of neighbouring properties; ii. the setting of a Listed Building or Conservation Area; iii. the natural beauty of an AONB; iv. an internationally designated wildlife site; v. flood risk (i.e. is not within Flood Zones 2 or 3); or vi. protected Public Open Space.	Thank you for your comments which are noted.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF136	A and D Architecture	2) Policy ST1 should be modified by adding new sub-paragraph (f) to paragraph C as follows: f) No less than 60 pitches will be allocated for static caravan development.	Local Plan policies must be evidence led. The Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment 2019 provides no evidence to support this approach.
1195216	Resident	Is there any evidenced need for new houses to be built Any new garden village if needed should be built on brownfield sites such as Bevercotes and not on greenfield.	National policy requires the Council to provide housing to meet identified needs. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. The Local Plan does try to put as much development as possible on brownfield sites but there is not enough suitable land available to meet local needs. So some greenfield land is needed. Bevercotes is protected as a Local Wildlife Site so is unsuitable for residential development.
1195356	Resident	Easy access to A1 and A57 !!!!!!!!!!! Seriously..... the A57 from Gateford is a mass car park, what used to be a 35 - 40 minute commute to Sheffield is now approx. 90 minutes or more. Access to A1 through Worksop via Five Lane Ends is horrendous and getting worse with the building of DHL so more lorries. It can take me 15 minutes just to get through Worksop alone. And travelling to the A1 via Blyth is slightly quicker however that road also contends with HGV from Peppers Warehouse and Blyth is struggling to cope with this and normal cars and you want to add a futher potential 3000 cars onto that route by building houses on ST15 HS1 Peaks Hill Farm. The infrastructure cannot handle it and you refuse to change as you will only build 40 houses at a time to slip the through the loop hole that the Highways Agency limit state is 40 + houses then requires a change of roads. As currently been seen on Thievesdale Lane This cannot be allowed to happen the roads cannot cope and are accidents waiting to happen	The Local Plan is informed by the Bassetlaw Transport Study Parts 1, 2 and 3 which identifies the impact of the allocations on the highways network and recommends highway improvements to aid traffic flow around the town including to the A57 and a new road between Blyth Road and Carlton Road. The Council continues to work with Nottinghamshire County Council Highways and Highways England on the Local Plan. This ensures proposed allocations are suitable and deliverable in highways terms.
1195356	Resident	<i>Worksop will deliver...</i> Re read your quote above so why do we need another 1500 houses been built Peaks Hill Farm ST15 HS1 on top of the 174 houses been built by Rippon Homes The Lodge on land off Blyth Road/Thievesdale Lane This cannot be allowed to happen.... you are destroying green land , eco friendly land, animal welfare , established rural landscape for no reasonable or sustainable use. Promoting the efficient and effective use... This again is a complete contradiction to Peaks Hill Farm ST15 HS1 where you are actually destroying versatile agricultural landif the farmers want to sell at least use if for energy like solar farm or wind farm not 1500 houses that are not required as previously stated	National policy requires the Council to provide housing to meet identified needs. This needs to be part of a Local Plan which is a statutory requirement. The Local Plan does try to put as much development as possible on brownfield sites but there is not enough suitable land available to meet local needs. So some greenfield and agricultural land is needed.
REF171	Bawtry Town Council	Paragraph 5.1.25 states that, at 30/11/2019, 185 new homes had been delivered in Harworth & Bircotes and that a further 1,853 are "in the pipeline". Presumably the latter figure includes the development of 650 new homes on land south of the A631 Bawtry Rd, Harworth, for which approval was given last year. The population of Harworth & Bircotes is approximately 7,500 at present. This expansion will take it to over 12,000. The sites of some of the new and planned developments in Harworth are less than 2 miles from Bawtry's High Street; in terms of travelling time Bawtry is as close as the centre of Harworth. Concern that such a substantial expansion of Harworth & Bircotes will place an unsustainable load upon Bawtry's facilities, services and infrastructure. The Localism Act 2011 established a Duty to Cooperate between neighbouring planning authorities in relation to cross-boundary issues, including transport and infrastructure. This was acknowledged in the Initial Draft Plan to: "Support opportunities for the retention, or creation, of new community and transport infrastructure, facilities and services, and ensure that impacts on them are appropriately mitigated, including where new development impacts on areas outside of Bassetlaw's boundary." In our response to the Initial Draft we suggested there should be clarification of how this commitment would be delivered, in the context of our concern about adverse impact upon Bawtry. Appendix 2 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan January 2019 concerns about impact upon Bawtry of the expansion of Harworth & Bircotes appeared to have been acknowledged, and there was a statement that BDC and Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council were	A Statement of Common Ground has been signed between the Council and Doncaster Council which includes an ongoing commitment to work together to manage traffic impacts across boundaries. The Local Plan proposes no allocations in Harworth & Bircotes. The development referred to has planning permission and transport infrastructure improvements have been agreed through the planning application process for each site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
		to "continue to meet as and when required to address cross boundary issues, with the next step being agreeing a Statement of Common Ground." Requested involvement in that process, and BDC responded by stating that the Statement of Common Ground referred to was between the two planning authorities, but they would "explore the potential of a Statement of Common Ground with Bawtry Town Council at the relevant time."	
1195879	Hamlin Estates TwelveTwentyOne Planning Services	It is clear that the Local Plan seeks to identify a realistic level of housing and there is general concern that the proposed level of 468 dpa does not take account of historic underprovision across the District. The proposed spread of housing is unlikely to be achieved as there is ample evidence to show that sites such as a 'garden village' have a long gestation before and during delivery. It is thus unrealistic to expect this to deliver the full 750 units in the Local Plan - 500 would be more realistic.	The calculation of housing need (using national guidance Standard Method) takes into consideration under delivery. As such there is no requirement to add it on. The Bassetlaw Local Housing Need and Economic Need Assessment 2020 provides the evidence for the housing requirement and housing delivery.
REF198	Consultant	Para 5.1.49 page 30 This refers to ST1 which again confirms that the house numbers can be delivered but also states that this, so called, "step change" is to be included. Why? If the figures can be achieved, what evidence is there that we need a step change?	National policy requires the Council to provide housing to meet identified needs. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. This is also a requirement of national policy. The step change refers to the need to deliver better paid higher skilled jobs to the benefit of residents.
REF199	Cushwake	It is noted that following an updated assessment the Council has reviewed the housing requirement in light of the opportunities for an increase in economic growth across the District over the Plan period. There is a requirement to deliver a minimum of 478 dwellings per annum or a minimum of 9087 dwellings over the plan period and this increase is welcome and the inclusion of 'minimum' within the policy text of Policy ST1C (1) is in line with our previous representation and suggested amendment to the policy wording.	Support noted and welcome.
REF199	Cushwake	Policy ST1 as drafted is unjustified and unsound. Development in large and small rural settlements is capped at 20%, however the Council have not provided any clear justification for this cap in the evidence base. Each application should be determined on its own merits based on the principles of sustainable development and the future sustainable growth of rural settlements should not be restricted because an arbitrary cap of 20% has been reached. Consider that the restriction on development for larger settlements to site areas of 1ha or less for housing sites that are not allocated either through the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan is not justified. Similarly, for small rural settlements, development proposals are restricted to 10 dwellings – again this is not evidenced and therefore not justified.	Policy ST1 has been updated to reflect comments received from the previous consultation in January. This has led to a change to the proposed percentage requirement and to the list of eligible Small Rural Settlements. The updated Rural Settlement Paper provides a narrative to the evolution of the strategy for rural Bassetlaw since 2016 and how the percentage requirements were derived and changed overtime. The NPPF encourages local and neighbourhood plans to identify, " land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare" and therefore the Local Plan is encouraging this through rural development and through the allocation of sites within neighbourhood plans. The limit to 10 dwellings per site for Small Rural Settlements has been dropped.
REF205	Resident	The Policy proposes delivering sustainable development and growth appropriate to the size of each settlement. This Policy is supported.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF214	Oxalis Planning	<p>Broadly support Policy ST1. Agree that the most logical approach to delivering the District's housing needs over the Plan period is to direct the majority of housing towards the main towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth. It is a sensible and logical approach to divide the majority of the rest of development across the Large Rural Settlements, as these locations already have the infrastructure in place to enable them to accommodate sustainable growth, which will, in turn, help to sustain the vitality of these locations. Support Misterton's identification as a 'Large Rural Settlement'. To accord with the Council's vision and objectives, new development should ensure that it seeks to mitigate its potential impact through the provision of physical, social and green infrastructure, to ensure that growth within the Large Rural Settlements is sustainable for the long-term. However, we do not agree with the proposed distribution of housing within the Large Rural Settlements, which is limited to those sites identified within Neighbourhood Plans. The inherent nature of Neighbourhood Plans means that they have a strong focus on the local area and consequently parochial ambitions, but they do not necessarily deliver the strategic scale thinking which is required to ensure that the strategic needs of the District are accounted for. If the Large Rural Settlements are to deliver both strategic and local needs, as required through paragraph 4.1.8 of the Local Plan, then the Council should review the Neighbourhood Plan allocations and consider: 1) Whether additional sites should be allocated; and 2) whether Policy ST1 should contain in built flexibility to enable additional sites to come forward in the Large Rural Settlements to meet the strategic needs of the District, if the allocations from the Neighbourhood Plans do not come forward as expected, or do not deliver on the District's strategic needs. Previously promoted land at Grovewood Road, Misterton, through the Council's 'call for sites' and through the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan process. The Neighbourhood Plan has not allocated land at Grovewood Road for development, despite the fact that it is available now, for immediate delivery; it has the capacity to deliver up to 150 dwellings; it is in one of the most sustainable locations in the village, located in Flood Zone 1 and directly adjacent to the Primary School; the proposals for the site include a substantial level of green infrastructure, including the retention of the majority of the hedgerows within the site, which would be supplemented through additional planting; and the site could deliver community infrastructure and facilities in the form of playing pitches and a pavilion. The fact that the site has been overlooked for allocation by the Neighbourhood Plan and the restrictive nature of Policy ST1 means that the District could lose out on the opportunity to provide a long-term sustainable housing delivering solution for Misterton. This could also be the case in other Neighbourhood Plan areas across the District. The Grovewood Road site could help the Council deliver on its housing needs, in a sustainable location, if the Neighbourhood Plan allocations do not progress as anticipated. Policy ST1 should be amended to include the necessary flexibility to ensure that the Local Plan remains relevant and sustainable throughout the Plan period (amendments shown in dark red): "A minimum of 1764 dwellings on sites allocated or to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans, or on sites brought forward where it is demonstrated that there is a clear need for development and that it can be delivered quickly and sustainably to provide necessary housing for the Large Rural Settlements".</p>	<p>Consistent with national planning policy, the Council promotes Neighbourhood Planning as an appropriate tool for the local community to influence the way their local area grows. This is reflected in the Local Plan and the approach taken to Large Rural Settlements. These settlements are not as sustainable as the Main Towns therefore 20% growth is considered appropriate, unless the local community choose to exceed that figure through a neighbourhood plan. This approach ensures the local community retain influence over the sustainable growth of their area. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be reviewed and updated in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. This provides Neighbourhood Plan Groups to review the delivery of development and allocate new sites where necessary.</p>
REF214	Oxalis Planning	<p>Support the overarching plan for the District, as described through the Bassetlaw 'vision' which states at paragraph 4.1.6 that, by 2037, new development "will have been delivered in the most sustainable locations". Paragraph 4.1.8 explains, in broad terms, how this will be achieved, stating that the large rural settlements (including Misterton) will deliver residential development "to meet strategic and local needs. Necessary physical, social, green and digital infrastructure and community facilities need to support this growth will have been delivered on time". Agree that it a sensible and logical approach to distribute development to the most sustainable locations within the District, which includes those settlements defined as the Large Rural Settlements.</p>	<p>Support noted and welcome.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF215	Trustees of H S Wallis	<p>Para. 5.1.2 draws special attention to what is seen as a step change in the District's economy in seeking to reflect new priorities. Draws attention to one of these priorities - the growth zone associated with the AI strategic corridor - (this approach derives from the 2019 Spatial Strategy Background Paper in which the value of the AI corridor associated with Harworth is recognised as a "logistics corridor"). The following paragraph then summarises Draft Policy ST1 -to encourage the effective use of greenfield land " where this will bring social, economic and environmental benefits.... ". This in turn derives from the Background Paper para. 1.3 in setting the scene for the Local plan to look for "...sustainable housing growth particularly in the rural parts of the District. " There are few sites better placed to achieve these objectives than the site fitting so well as it does into the local landscape and the built forms of "North Blyth", proximity to the AI and close relationship with substantial areas having permission for employment uses. Subsequent paragraphs set out the process by which the Spatial Strategy has emerged. They refer to the wish to retain the Main Town, Large and Small Rural Settlements hierarchy. No where in the document is there any indication that the distinctiveness of "North Blyth" is recognised or where it does or might fit into this categorisation. Whilst being within the parish of Blyth the area could not be more distinct and separate (not least by the AI) from the core of the more historic core of Blyth. There is an argument for suggesting it is a settlement in its own right but equally it could be argued that it is better for all planning purposes to see it as being "clustered" with the main town of Harworth/Bircotes just to the north. Paras 5.1.24 - 5.1.26 briefly describe Harworth/Bircotes in part in the following terms "Harworth & Bircotes is' a strategically advantageous economic location and is expected to deliver significant employment growth (see Policy ST6)....reflecting its easy access to the AI (M)" Paras. 5.1.27 - 5.1.31 then set out the approach to be taken with Large Rural Settlements (LRS) of which Blyth is one of five. Having noted that the rural settlements of Bassetlaw vary considerably Para. 5.1.28 goes on to state about the LRS's that they:- "...are the most sustainable due to them having the largest populations having higher numbers of journeys made to employment, shops and services and having the most frequent and commercially viable public transport services to nearby larger towns and cities. All serve both the settlements themselves and the surrounding rural area. Focusing rural development there will help support existing facilities and provide a focal point for use by residents of the surrounding smaller villages and hamlets. " In earlier para. 5.1.9 the Draft Plan in referring to future housing states that the largest towns would see the largest growth (a not uncommon approach) but it then goes on to state "...but rural settlements would be able to increase their populations by up to 20%..." Nothing in the text indicates that this the approach is to be applied to LRS's. When the Draft plan later sets out its approach to Small Rural Settlements (SRS) it again refers to a 20% maximum per parish justified briefly on the basis of the need to sustain those villages which often have greater environmental constraints. It is only Draft Policy ST1 that clearly identifies that the 20% limit will only apply to SRS's. LRS's are to be planned in the same way as the Main Towns. policy ST1- B2a refers to land allocations and appropriate forms of development within their settlement boundaries. "North Blyth" does not have any development boundary. Given the very special and strategic advantages attaching to this part of the District and the planning permissions that have already been granted that is something of an anomaly.</p>	<p>Blyth is included within the Large Rural Settlements due to its size and function as a local service centre. North Blyth is not identified as an eligible settlement because the location is not considered to be sustainable in that location.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF215	Trustees of H S Wallis	<p>The Draft Local Plan appears to be diverging not only from what is set out above but also the "Vision for Bassetlaw 2037" set out in the Background Paper where at para. 4.12 it states "4.12 The district will a diverse and thriving economy with Worksop, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes and the Large Rural Settlements acting as employment and service centres for the surrounding rural areas... " In Draft Policy ST!:- CI it indicates that a minimum of 1764 dwellings are to be permitted in the LRS' s on "... sites allocated or to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans... " So a clear statement that allocations in the Local Plan will be made thus following through on the importance the Draft Plan is attaching to LRS's. However, in "Housing Distribution" at para. 7.1.6 it states:- " In the early plan period more development will be delivered by commitments in Worksop, Retford and Harworth & Bircotes; in sustainable locations in accordance with Policy STJ. Similarly housing development will take place in the Large Rural settlements either through Neighbourhood Plan allocations or via commitments " So now there to be NO Local Plan allocations for sites in LRS's? Then the Draft Plan sets out its Policy ST2 under the heading "Rural Bassetlaw ". Under ST2- B the policy approach seems to be 'let's leave it entirely to the Neighbourhood Plans' to which a 20% cap will be applied. Without further explanation LRS's now seem to have acquired a much reduced status in the hierarchy and are to be treated just like the SRS's' . The Draft policy at sub-paragraph B then in tabulating how the 1764 dwellings (the total in the table in the Plan is actually 1747 - the difference being half of the number of dwellings the subject site in "North Blyth" could provide) are to be distributed between the LRS's the text contains the following sentence:- "Most of this growth will be delivered through existing planning permissions or through allocated sites made in Neighbourhood Plans or this Local Plan as identified on the Policies Map" There is a clear conflict between not only Draft Strategic Policies 1 and 2 but between what the Draft Plan states to be its broader ambitions. As far as "North Blyth" is concerned not only does it appear that the Local Plan will remain ambivalent, but in abdicating its role in favour of the Blyth Neighbourhood Plan, which is (in the context of Draft Policy STI) seeking wrongly to apply a 20% cap, the strategic advantages of the area are to be wholly ignored. This seems to be a serious error and entirely contrary to the sentiments expressed in the earlier paragraphs 5.1.27 - 5.1.28 under the heading "Large Rural Settlements". THERE SEEMS JO BE LITTLE POINT IN EXPLAINING AND THEN ADOPTING A SETTLEMENT IDERARCHY HAVING THREE DISTINCT ELEMENTS AND THEN FOR THE HUGELY IMPORTANT FUNCTION OF PLANNING FOR HOUSING 'LUMPING' TWO OF THEM TOGETHER. It is noted the degree of reliance placed on developing a new settlement on the Cottam Power Station site. Given the challenges such a site presents not least in terms of clearance, contamination and flood risk and the inevitable timeframe, over which the Planning Authority has no control whatsoever, the site should surely not feature as a formal allocation but be regarded as a laudable ambition but in planning policy terms somewhat more as a windfall site. There is even a greater argument for it to be seen as an employment site rather than housing.</p>	<p>Blyth is included within the Large Rural Settlements due to its size and function as a local service centre. North Blyth is not identified as an eligible settlement because the location is not considered to be sustainable in that location.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF222	Notts CC	<p>NCC has considered the housing need as identified for each settlement as per the spatial strategy hierarchy outlined in Policy ST1 and so the following response is, wherever possible, in line with the Bassetlaw spatial strategy for growth which is the following: • Main Towns • Large Rural Settlement • Small rural settlements • Garden Villages Worksop Primary across the whole planning area, NCC anticipate that there will be sufficient places to meet demand set out in the Local Plan. Projected to be a shortage of school places in Gateford, which is due to be addressed by the delivery and possible expansion of a new Gateford Park Primary and Nursery School, to which HS1 / Policy 15 (Peak Hills Farm) refers. Secondary CIL is in operation in this area but NCC would instead intend to seek the s106 contributions that are required to mitigate the effects on education of further developments. NCC is already planning to expand Outwood Portland Academy to address existing pressures but the additional housing in the Local Plan would exacerbate the already significant shortfall of secondary places in this area. NCC would seek developer contributions towards the cost of adding a further 5-6 classrooms (c180 secondary places) arising solely from housing in the local plan, on top of existing plans, subject to feasibility; Outwood Portland may not be able to cope with yet more expansion, so the need for a new secondary school site and contributions cannot be discounted. NCC will seek to clarify this matter prior to the finalisation of the Plan. Retford Primary Across the whole planning area, NCC anticipate that demand set out in the Local Plan would require mitigation from developers. This would largely be used to fund the expansion of existing schools, although many are on small sites that offer little scope for this. Given the 3,250 dwellings proposed to be added to the Garden Village after 2037, a new 630-place (3 forms of entry) primary school would be required around the Ranby area. Secondary NCC anticipate a small surplus of places in this area, so pupils arising from housing developments in the Local Plan could be accommodated at existing schools. However, the proposed Garden Village would necessitate the addition of a further c500 secondary places, for which contributions would be required. Potential expansions of existing secondary schools would be subject to feasibility. If circumstances at the time of a formal application had changed – i.e. changing population, school rolls and school capacities – and a new secondary school was required in this area, NCC would also need developers to contribute land. Tuxford Primary Across the whole planning area, NCC anticipate that demand set out in the Local Plan would require mitigation from developers. This would be best used to fund the expansion of an existing school by approximately 3 classrooms. Expansion of any of the 3 local primary schools may be problematic, so further discussions and feasibility would be required. Secondary Tuxford Academy falls within the Retford secondary planning area. Harworth, incorporating Styrrup Primary Across the whole planning area, NCC anticipate that approximately 3 new classrooms would be required if the Local Plan came to fruition. New housing in Styrrup would require the expansion of Serlby Park's primary provision. Secondary NCC anticipate a small surplus of places in this area, so pupils arising from housing developments in the Local Plan could be accommodated in Serlby Park Academy's secondary provision. Langold, incorporating Blyth Primary Across the whole planning area, NCC anticipate that c300 additional primary school places would be required if the Local Plan came to fruition. (New housing in Blyth is anticipated to arise from the neighbourhood plan, rather than the draft Local Plan.)</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure necessary education infrastructure associated with development is delivered. This information will inform policy development and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Three of the four schools in this planning area are likely to have space to expand, subject to feasibility, so housing developer contributions would be calculated on that basis. Walkeringham and Misterton, incorporating West Stockwith Primary The Misterton and Walkeringham neighbourhood plans, upon which NCC Pupil Place Planning have not previously commented, would necessitate 2-3 additional classrooms. Misterton Primary has space to expand, subject to feasibility. Tuxford Primary This planning area encompasses Askham, Dunham-on-Trent, East Drayton, East Markham, Laneham, Headon-cum-Upton and Tuxford. Housing in the Local Plan would necessitate the addition of 1-2 classrooms in Tuxford. Housing in the respective Neighborhood Plans would require 1 further classroom. However, expansion of any of the 3 local primary schools would be problematic or impossible, so further discussions and feasibility would be required. Secondary Tuxford Academy (secondary) falls within the Retford secondary planning area; and so please see comments above under Retford, Secondary. Small Rural Settlements Claborough, incorporating Welham, Clayworth and Hayton NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Claborough Primary Cuckney, incorporating Holbeck and Nether Langwith NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Cuckney C of E Primary. Elkesley, incorporating Bothamsall NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighborhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Elkesley Primary and Nursery Everton NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Everton Primary Gamston NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Gamston C of E Primary Gringley NCC anticipate that housing described in local plan would require contributions towards an additional classroom. St Peter's Primary is on a restricted site, so expansion would be problematic, though reconfiguration may be possible. Further discussion and feasibility would be required. Leverton, incorporating Habbleshthorpe, and North and South Leverton NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Leverton C of E. Mattersey NCC anticipate that housing described in the neighbourhood plan could be accommodated within existing capacity at Mattersey Primary Misson NCC anticipate that housing described in the neighbourhood plan could be accommodated within existing capacity at Misson Primary Normanton on Trent, incorporating High and Low Marnham NCC anticipate that housing described in the local plan could be accommodated within existing capacity at St Matthew's C of E Primary. North Wheatley, incorporating South Wheatley and Bole NCC anticipate that housing described in local plan would require contributions to create an additional classroom. North Wheatley C of E Primary is on a restricted site, so expansion would be problematic. Further discussion and feasibility would be required. Rampton, incorporating Woodbeck and Treswell with Cottam NCC anticipate that contributions would be required to create 3 additional classrooms within the span of the local plan. Rampton Primary is on a restricted site and would be difficult to expand, so feasibility would be required. The development at Cottam Power Station is anticipated to add a further 1,150 houses after 2037, which would necessitate a new primary school and potentially land on which to build it. Ranskill, incorporating Barnby Moor, Scrooby and Torworth NCC anticipate that developments in the local plan would result in a small deficit of places at Ranskill Primary. If expansion was indeed required, the school site should be large enough to allow it although this would be subject to final confirmation. Shireoaks NCC anticipate that developments in the local plan would result in a small deficit of places at St Luke's C of E Primary. If expansion was required, the school site should be large enough to allow it though feasibility would be required. Sturton NCC anticipate that housing described in the local plan could be accommodated within existing capacity at Sturton C of E Primary Sutton-cum-Lound NCC anticipate that housing described in local and / or neighbourhood plans could be accommodated within existing capacity at Sutton-cum-Lound C of E Primary</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure necessary education infrastructure associated with development is delivered. This information will inform policy development and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
1196694	Resident	The vision of Bassetlaw attracting highly paid work, new business and growth in business, is based on an assumption that providing more business land will achieve this. Not aware that there is a shortage of such land at present. Bassetlaw already has the locational advantages of proximity to road links and Doncaster airport, yet these businesses are not attracted to locate here. Parag 4.2 of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule notes that of the new developments: 81% are greenfield and 19% are brownfield. This is an appalling scenario for our environment. Bassetlaw is ahead of schedule to meet its targets for housebuilding by 2037. It should not be approving plans to build on so much greenfield land. It should continue to review what brownfield sites become available in the decades to come. There will be new brownfield sites available before (and after) 2037 which can be considered for residential building. 5.1.49 refers to building more quality housing than is required – this cannot be justified: once greenfield land is built on, it is lost forever; there is nothing sustainable about this approach.	National policy requires the Council to provide housing and employment to meet identified needs. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. The Local Plan does try to put as much development as possible on brownfield sites but there is not enough suitable land available to meet local needs. So some greenfield land is needed.
1196694	Resident	Parag 3.30 – the contribution of tree planting – is this annual figure referring to the amount absorbed once trees reach maturity? What number of years is being allowed to reach maturity? In the interim the amount of carbon absorbed would be negligible and far less than any mature trees felled for development.	Paragraph 3.30 states that this the figure refers to trees at maturity.
1196694	Resident	4.1.3 and 5.1.40 - The vision of Bassetlaw attracting highly paid work, new business and growth in business, is based on an assumption that providing more business land will achieve this. Not aware that there is a shortage of such land at present. Bassetlaw already has the locational advantages of proximity to road links and Doncaster airport, yet these businesses are not attracted to locate here.	Sites at Manton Wood and Symmetry Park are being developed at the moment. There is a need to identify land to meet the needs of the D2N2 growth sectors to attract better paid higher skilled jobs to the District.
REF247	Babworth Parish Council	Applaud the vision of a positive framework. Appreciate consideration of the implementation of the Local Plan so that the true ambitions remain the priority, and that our beautiful countryside is not lost and our local towns remain empty and without investment.	Support noted and welcome.
REF253	Fisher German	The Spatial Strategy which proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District's development needs is broadly supported. The proposed role of Retford as a 'Main Town' reflects the town's role and sustainability credentials. Retford benefits from significant service provision and excellent transport connections and is considered sound for the town to be identified for future economic and residential growth. The Council's ambition to deliver increased housing, above base Local Housing Need established through the standardised methodology, is also supported. An uplift in housing is required to ensure an active working population is readily available in order to deliver the District's economic growth aspirations. This is a positive strategy which reflects the aims of the NPPF, both in supporting economic growth and boosting significantly the supply of housing. A buffer of 5% is considered appropriate when calculating housing land supply requirements, having regard for the 2019 housing delivery test results. With regards to spatial distribution, the Council intends to locate 60% of its housing requirement in the Main Towns of Retford, Worksop and Harworth. This approach is supported as it focuses development in the most sustainable locations. Concerns are however raised in respect of the Bassetlaw Garden Village (Policy ST3). The Garden Village allocation is intended to make a significant contribution to achieving and meeting the housing requirement within the Plan period, equating to just over 8% of the total requirement. To ensure a sound Plan it is imperative to ensure that the Council's delivery assumptions for the site are realistic. The assumptions currently made in respect of the delivery of the site are considered ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. In addition to the above approximately 12% of the total requirement for the Plan period is reliant on Neighbourhood Plans, or non-allocated sites across the 42 Small Rural Settlements to be delivered. This is a significant quantum of development across numerous settlements and has the potential to risk the delivery of the Plan.	Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Garden Villages in other areas of the country. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020).

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
1196906	Resident	There is a single reference to infrastructure provision for electric vehicles post 2035 within the scope of this entire strategy. To suggest populations will be drawn towards public transport links in new developments, particularly the proposed 'Garden Village' and Cottam sites is naive and blinkered at best. Isolated developments such as these will create increased vehicle movements to other employment/leisure/shopping sites. This strategy MUST include electric vehicle infrastructure provision to offset these carbon loading issues.	Policy ST45 and Policy ST50 requires all new development to incorporate appropriate infrastructure to enable the connection to an electric vehicle charging point in future. This future proofs development by ensuring that over time, and as technology develops, different charging units can be installed which reflects consumer choice.
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>The Local Plan states that Bassetlaw forms a vital part of the wider Nottinghamshire and SCR economies. Therefore, Bassetlaw sees a significant level of out-commuting in addition to in-commuting from neighbouring authorities. Economic composition is, therefore, interlinked between these authorities. Agree with paragraph 3.2 that “the performance of the local economy is a key driver that shapes Bassetlaw into a successful and growing location” and that growth of business is integral for creating a sustainable local economy for the District’s continued prosperity. 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 which is not overly reliant on the supply of labour elsewhere within the region. The People Bassetlaw’s growing population puts an increasing pressure on the Council’s housing. Paragraph 3.12 states a projected population increase of 3.8% by 2037 equates to over 4,350 additional residents which puts increased demand on the need for housing across the District. However, the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw SHMA OAN Update (October 2017) within the Council’s evidence base provides the projected population growth for Bassetlaw as per the latest (2014 based) Sub-National Population Projections published by ONS in May 2016. The data shows the 2014-based population of Bassetlaw was 114,143 and projected to increase to 120,927 by 2035 (5.9% increase). The above population projection reflects a higher increase as set out within the Draft Local Plan and does not take into account the significant level of economic growth and step change within the District which is likely to further drive growth of the population. It is our position that this puts additional strain of the need for new homes. Paragraph 3.13 indicates the population of 16-64 working aged population is projected to fall by 7.3% over the plan period. These demographic changes reinforce the importance for substantial housing delivery across Bassetlaw and the delivery of sufficient employment land to provide jobs and retain the declining working population. Policy within the Local Plan must seek to change the direction of those trends beyond what the current policy approach has achieved. The retention of existing young people and attraction of in-migrants of working age will only be achieved through the provision of suitable job opportunities, provision of affordable and attractive housing to younger and working age people and through the provision of vibrant and attractive towns. The Place Paragraph 3.17 sets out that, as of 2018, 67% of the District’s population live in Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes. Only 15% of the population lives in Large Rural Settlements and 18% in the remaining Small Rural Settlements. Provides a basis that the Plan should amend the proportion of housing requirement in the Main Towns and reduce the proportion allocated for rural settlements to appropriately reflect the needs of the District. Agree that Bassetlaw benefits from strong transport links by road and rail, including a strong network of bus services in some locations. The Local Plan refers to the sustainable accessibility of Retford at paragraphs 3.18 and 3.19. Retford train station provides direct access to the East Coast Mainline and London within 2 hours. Paragraph 3.19 states Retford bus station provides access to the wider District whereas rural parts of Bassetlaw have less frequent coverage. Advocate the suitability of Retford for an increased proportion of growth compared to less accessible locations due to its established and sustainable transport network. The effective cycle network in Worksop and Retford is identified within Chapter 3, making them sustainable locations for development by enabling sustainable movement between residential areas, work and leisure. Worksop and Retford have expanded along with their population and the delivery of new homes has spearheaded regeneration in these areas, acting as a catalyst for</p>	<p>The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's place in the settlement hierarchy. This will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development appropriate to their needs that maintains and supports local services and facilities.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
		investment. The Local Plan emphasises “the need for new housing remains as important as ever” at paragraph 3.24 which we support, suggest the Local Plan should review its spatial housing strategy in order to reflect these needs of new homes in the Main Towns.	
REF270	Barton Willmore	Chapter 4 sets out the Council’s vision and objectives for Bassetlaw in 2037 for increased access to quality homes, high skilled jobs and a range of quality facilities and services. Support those aspirations; stress that the key to the effectiveness of the Local Plan is in its ability to achieve that vision.Strong concerns over the plan’s ability to do so. The vision for Retford set out in paragraph 4.1.7 is that it will have “retained and enhanced its character through a significant public realm intervention strengthening its town centre offer and providing an attractive base for cultural and visitor economy events”. Support the delivery of town centre improvements and public realm strengthening. In the first instance, the vitality and vibrancy of the town, as with most other towns within the country will rely on growth and investment; and expenditure from future residents which is not reflected in the Councils vision for Retford. Suggest the vision for Retford in 2037 should be more ambitious by supporting more housing development in the area and performing its existing role as one of the strongest housing market areas to drive forward housing growth in the District. Retford is a significant contributor to the delivery of new homes within the District and a clearly desirable location. As the district looks to make a step change in its economic performance it will be reliant on inward investment and economic in migrants being attracted to live in the district. Whilst some Rural Settlements will require small-scale and sensitively located development to support local needs and to support local services and facilities, the level of development being proposed across both the large and small rural settlements is arbitrary (in particular a proposed 20% growth target for the large rural settlements) and will cause harm to the overall sustainability of the district. Oppose the Council’s vision for the new Bassetlaw Garden Village, consider the approach to be unsound, unfeasible and unviable. It should be the Council’s priority to enhance existing settlements such as Retford and Harworth where development can benefit from existing transport networks and support the local economy and wider rural hinterlands rather than attempting to create a new village and transport hub which we consider not to be viable.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's place in the settlement hierarchy. This will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development appropriate to their needs that maintains and supports local services and facilities. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible.
REF270	Barton Willmore	Supportive of the Local Plan’s spatial strategy promoting a ‘step change’ for Bassetlaw’s economy with growth focused around strategic corridors and growth zones and the three Main Towns as articulated at paragraph 5.1.2. 2.34 Disagree with paragraph 5.1.3 which states the Local Plan is in accordance with the NPPF’s presumption in favour of sustainable development and that it “seeks to fully meet the demands for new homes, jobs and services in the District in the most sustainable manner”. This same paragraph reiterates that the Main Towns are the primary focus for growth, do not consider that those aims will be realised with the current drafting of the Local Plan. The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan proposed a ‘hybrid’ approach to its spatial strategy. In our previous representations we supported this hybrid approach in principle which sought to distribute development based on the scale, role, service provision, land availability and opportunities for investment and growth of settlements to benefit wider rural communities. This meant directing growth towards Worksop, Retford and Harworth and supported by rural settlements. The 2020 Draft Local Plan has reintroduced a settlement hierarchy for the District in Policy ST1. Paragraph 5.1.13 states that Policy ST1 acknowledges the importance of reducing the need to travel and prioritises major growth in the three Main Towns which we support. This is not only vital in terms of localised movement, but has an impact on regional transport networks as evidenced by the comments within the Doncaster SOCG. The growth needed to support the district’s aspirations needs to be realised within the distr ict as far as possible. Have significant concerns with how the spatial strategy has proportioned growth across the District; specifically in relation to the low level of housing requirement proposed for Retford, the overstated requirement for rural settlements and the proposed Garden Village. Despite the three Main Towns being placed at the top of the proposed settlement hierarchy, the growth required for the District to meet its economic aspirations has been	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's place in the settlement hierarchy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01	Bassetlaw's Spatial	Strategy	
		<p>underestimated and the subsequent development requirements have been understated. Paragraph 5.1.19 highlights that Retford has a population of 22,013 residents and boasts a wide range of services, facilities, shops, employment opportunities and transport links. As well as being designated as a Main Town at the top of the settlement hierarchy, Retford is also described as “a good location for development” at paragraph 5.1.20, which should be supported by policy within the Local Plan rather than constraining development in this sustainable location. The Spatial Strategy Background Paper 2019 states Retford is the second largest town in the District, population of 22,000 and is a key infrastructure and service centre. Retford is described as the main hub settlement for Bassetlaw’s central and eastern rural areas and is well connected by highways and rail links. Understand the point made at paragraph 5.1.21 of the Local Plan that “Retford is not expected to accommodate as much economic growth in the plan period”. Stress that this is not a justification for the constraining of development at Retford and misunderstands the potential role of the town in meeting the development needs of the district as a whole.</p>	
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>The level of housing requirement currently proposed for Retford is 1303 homes (equating to only 14% of the overall housing requirement). Paragraph 5.1.22 of the Local Plan sets out that the requirement for Retford is based on the same level of housing identified within the Core Strategy (2011) which equates to 87.4 dwellings per annum. Fundamentally disagree with the above approach. The Core Strategy is, by the Council’s own admission, based on out of date evidence and cannot be taken as an up to date position on the housing needs of the district. The housing requirement for the district, and the distribution of that requirement must be based on proportionate and justified evidence. Even if we were to accept the approach of projecting the Core Strategy requirement of 87.4dpa over the Local Plan period that would equate to a requirement of 1,661 dwellings over the plan period. However, the Local Plan seeks to apply the Core Strategy requirement over a period between 2010-2037 and then reduce the level of development proposed at Retford by the 1057 dwellings delivered since 2010; resulting in a residual requirement of 1,303 dwellings for the plan period. Even if the overarching requirement was sound, which it is not, the residual requirement bears no resemblance to the calculation of need for the plan period. The Local Plan explains that 666 dwellings currently have planning permission in Retford and 109 dwellings have a resolution to grant, leaving a residual requirement of only 528 dwellings in Retford up to 2037. The result of the above mechanism is a wholly under -representative housing requirement for Retford that will constrain the level of development permitted at Retford significantly below the level of development it can and should deliver to meet the district’s aims. 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. Strongly object to Retford being allocated only 1303 of the overall housing requirements for the District as set out in Figure 1 below. Retford, as the District’s second largest town , has been allocated the second least amount of housing development among the existing settlements despite its position in the settlement hierarchy. This is despite Retford having suitable sites for development and a proven track record of delivering housing where other settlements within the District have been less successful. The above allocation will lead to the undue restriction of development towards the end of the plan period and leave no reasonable flexibility in the supply of housing land through the plan period to respond to change. This is completely at odds with the economic aspirations of the plan. Consider that 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 which has simply not been evidenced based on what levels of growth are required to support the rural area. Such an evidenced based approach is vital to understanding, and planning for, the future health of rural settlements. It is not clear from the Local Plan or its evidence base how the final apportionment of</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01	Bassetlaw's Spatial	Strategy	
		development across the District has been determined or how the site selection methodology for identifying sites has been arrived at. 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.	
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>The Council's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) 2016/17 sets out the level of housing completions in the District between 2006/7 to 2016/17. Across the whole district, 3474 net housing completions were made over that period. 2,619 of those completions were within the 3 Main Towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth. Some 1,321 completions were in Retford which comprises 38% of the overall completions across the entire District and over half of the completions within the District's Main Towns. The AMR demonstrates that 2005/06 to 2016/17 Retford has delivered 384 more dwellings than Worksop. The AMR states that, notwithstanding the recession, from 2005/06 to 2016/17 Retford averaged the delivery of some 110dpa which increased to an average of 152dpa in the 6 years since 2010/11 when recovery from the recession commenced. The monitoring demonstrates that the proposed distribution of development in Local Plan dramatically underestimates the role of Retford in the housing market. Retford has clearly provided the backbone for the Bassetlaw's housing delivery within a District that has struggled to meet its Core Strategy housing requirement. Crucially, the above evidence demonstrates that Retford is a desirable location within the district to buy a home. At a time that the Council is seeking to deliver a step change in the economic growth and aspirations of the district, it is vital that its most popular housing market is utilised to its full effect. Delivering sufficient homes in a location where people want to live will be a key to the success of the district. Consider that it is perverse for the Council to seek to deliver a level of growth at Retford of 87.4dpa, which would be realised as a target of circa 60dpa once completions from 2010 are taken into account, which is less than half of the delivery in the last 6 years and which has been the best performing market area across a District that has a track record of struggling to deliver its housing requirement elsewhere. That unduly low level of development becomes even more difficult to understand with the Council having failed to provide any substantive evidence for such a reduction in the housing requirement and in the face of an excellent supply of suitable and developable Sites, including our Client's Site to the south of Retford. Recognise that the distribution of development to rural settlements is important to support existing facilities and meet local needs, the proportion of housing requirement in these rural settlements is currently excessive and unjustified. Policy ST1 should be re-drafted to reflect our comments. This includes: • Increased housing growth towards Retford; • Removal of proposals for a new Garden Village; and • Reduction in the development directed towards the Rural Area. Supportive of Policy ST1 directing development to appropriate locations in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, a greater housing requirement should be proportioned to support growth and development in the Main Towns. Disagree with B 2(c) of Policy ST1 which supports Bassetlaw Garden Village in accordance with Policy ST3. The requirement of 750 dwellings for the new Garden Village should be removed and re-proportioned via a revised spatial strategy. The overall minimum housing requirement for the District set out in Policy ST1 is 9,087 dwellings. This housing requirement should be amended to at least 10,640 and distributed more appropriately across the District, with a reduction for Rural Settlements and more focus on Retford. Emphasise the policy's aim to enhance the role of the District's Main Towns. This should be reflected through an appropriate housing requirement. Retford is a major contributor to the Council's overall housing delivery, consider that the level of development in Retford should be dramatically increased in recognition of its fundamental role in maintaining the sustainability of the rural east of 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 minimum housing requirement of 1,764 dwellings for Large Rural Settlements and 1,090 for Small Rural Settlements is not justified and is not a sound approach. The level of development to be delivered in the rural settlements should be based on a robust assessment of each of those settlements which</p>	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
		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.	
REF275	Consultant	In Chapter 4, the vision for Retford is described “retained and enhanced its character through a significant public realm intervention strengthening its town centre offer and providing an attractive base for cultural and visitor economy events”. Wholly support it is our concern that this plan is not able to achieve this. The success of this town of reliant on investment and growth,, it appears in this plan that this will not be achieved. Suggest that Retford should be supporting further housing development. Retford has proved to be one of the strongest housing markets in the area with no indication that this would not continue. With further housing will come increased use of the town centre and job creation helping to drive the local economy. Support a modest growth of rural settlements, however, with limited infrastructure and facilities currently in place, the growth should remain in keeping with their current size to retain the character of these communities. The growth of Retford would only work to serve these communities for their local services and needs.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF275	Consultant	Generally supportive of the spatial strategy presented (ST1), which is promoting growth focused around strategic corridors, growth zones and the three main towns of Worksop, Retford and Harworth. Disagree that this is aligned with the NPPF and its presumption in favour of sustainable development which is stated in this local plan. This section is promoting the main towns as the primary focus for growth and yet this is not realised further in the rest of the plan. Despite these main towns being places at the top of the proposed settlement hierarchy the aspirations economically have been underestimated and as such the developmental requirements have also. The plan states that Retford boasts a wide range of services, facilities, shops, employment opportunities and transport links. It goes on to suggest that Retford itself is a good location for development. This is not supported by the policy within the local plan, instead, it is covered with a policy designed to constrain any growth, despite being a sustainable location. Retford is the districts second largest town and yet it has been allocated the second least amount of housing. This does not align with the balanced increase across the district as stated in the plan. Given that Retford has plenty of available and sustainable locations for development, as well as plenty of successful examples of delivering the site, this position is unsubstantiated.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF277	Babworth Parish Council	The Parish are supportive of Bassetlaw’s economic aspirations for the district. Concerns regarding how those aspirations are proposed to be delivered and concerns in relation to how the Local Plan proposes to meet the needs of its communities. Chapter 4 osets out the Council’s vision and objectives for increased access to quality homes, high skilled jobs and a range of quality facilities and services. Support those aspirations; stress that the key to the effectiveness of the Local Plan is in its ability to achieve that vision. Strong concerns over the plan’s ability to do so. Concerned that the emerging approach to spatial distribution of development is unsound. Consider that the Local Plan fails to direct sufficient growth to its main towns, and consider the level of housing growth proposed to be directed towards the rural areas is excessive and not based on sound planning principles; including the proposal for a ‘garden village’ within the parish of Babworth and the allocation of housing to Ranby village which the Parish objects to. The Parish’s main service centre is Retford which the Parish is reliant upon for the provision of most of its day to day needs. The vision for Retford is that “Retford will have retained and enhanced its character through a significant public realm intervention strengthening its town centre offer and providing an attractive base for cultural and visitor economy events”. Support the delivery of town centre improvements and public realm strengthening. The vitality and vibrancy of the town is reliant on an appropriate level of growth being delivered at the town. Oppose the Council’s vision for the new Bassetlaw Garden Village and consider the approach to be unsound, unfeasible and unviable	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF277	Babworth Parish Council	Policy ST1 of the Local Plan should be re-drafted suggest that a greater housing requirement should be proportioned to support growth and development in the Main Towns and larger settlements. Object to Part B2(c) of Policy ST1 which supports Bassetlaw Garden Village in accordance with Policy ST3. The requirement of 750 dwellings for the new Garden Village should be removed. Emphasise the policy's aim to enhance the role of the District's Main Towns this should be reflected through an appropriate housing requirement. Retford is a major contributor to the Council's overall housing delivery, and the level of development in Retford should be dramatically increased in recognition of its fundamental role in maintaining the sustainability of the rural east of 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 minimum housing requirement of 1,764 dwellings for Large Rural Settlements and 1,090 for Small Rural Settlements. The level of development to be delivered in the 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.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.
REF278	Fisher German	The Spatial Strategy proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District's development needs is broadly supported. The Council's ambition to deliver increased housing, above base Local Housing Need established through the standardised methodology, is supported. An uplift in housing is required to ensure an active working population is readily available in order to deliver the District's economic growth aspirations. This is a positive strategy which reflects the aims of the NPPF, both in supporting economic growth and boosting significantly the supply of housing. A buffer of 5% is considered appropriate when calculating housing land supply requirements, having regard for the 2019 housing delivery test results. With regards to spatial distribution, concerned in respect of the Bassetlaw Garden Village (Policy ST3). The Garden Village allocation is intended to make a significant contribution to achieving and meeting the housing requirement within the Plan period, equating to just over 8% of the total requirement. To ensure a sound Plan it is imperative to ensure that the Council's delivery assumptions for the site are realistic. The assumptions currently made in respect of the delivery of the site are considered ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. Approximately 12% of the total requirement for the Plan period is reliant on Neighbourhood Plans, or non-allocated sites across the 42 Small Rural Settlements (including Treswell). This is a significant quantum of development across numerous settlements and has the potential to risk the delivery of the Plan. The Council need to do more to ensure that the number of dwellings assigned to the Small Rural Settlements will be delivered.	Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Garden Villages in other areas of the country. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020). The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF281	Notts Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome the inclusion of a settlement hierarchy at ST1 B.2. This directs development to the most sustainable locations and provides clarity for decisions on planning applications over the Plan period.	Support noted and welcome.
1197063	Resident	Para 1.9.2 CIL monies are provided to support the infrastructure required for additional housing. This should remain as is, smaller rural villages require this additional money to increase amenities etc. than larger rural areas. CIL rates are also a way of reflecting the overall impact that development may have on an are from the surrounding villages andthe new garden village for example.	The Council is proposing to retain CIL in the District. Site allocations of 50 or more units are exempt from CIL but will be delivering infrastructure through developer contributions instead.
1197063	Resident	Unclear how the calculations around growth have been conducted. Worksop is twice the size of Retford. The policy acknowledges this and the environmental differences between Retford and Worksop, yet it appears that Retford is required to deliver houses in excess of 70% of Worksop's required increase for 2010-2037 (2360-2180). Why is this and what is the rationale when the policy also acknowledges the constraints required re "safeguarding the landscape setting, preventing coalescence with neighbouring settlements, avoiding areas of flood risk, protecting the heritage and the ecological value of Retford's environment"? The figures and calculations are (deliberately?) confusing. Figures quoted are not comparable as they refer to different time periods i.e. Retford' calculated figure is from 2010-2037 (para 5.1.22) whereas Worksop's figures seem to be for 2018-2037(para. 5.1.17). To avoid confusion and clarity the figures quote throughout the document must be drawn from a consistent time period.	Worksop already has a significant amount of land for housing with current planning commitments. This needs to be deducted from the requirement. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The time period for Retford is 2018 to 2037. The reference to 2010 is to highlight housing delivery since the adoption of the current Local Plan (Bassetlaw Core Strategy).

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
1197063	Resident	Para 5.1.32. states that for small rural settlements, there has been a total of 1747 dwellings already allocated within Neighbourhood Plans. This exceeds the required value of 1090 dwellings required at 20%. This is again confusing as it suggests that Neighbourhood Plans are already delivering over and above what is required. Villages who have produced a Neighbourhood Plan have undertaken significant work required to consult with local residents and identify growth needs in line with continuing to keep the character and amenities of the village. The Local Plan does not acknowledge their importance and should have been developed using these figures as a framework. So use the figure they have already created and impose the cap should be for villages where a Neighbourhood Plan is not in place?	The level and distribution of housing has been amended following consultation in January and updated evidence. Policy ST1 proposes a revised settlement hierarchy and the distribution of growth which includes around 1400 for the Large Rural Settlements and 1500 for the Small Rural Settlements. This in combination with neighbourhood plan allocations, housing commitments and completions means that the majority of growth has been permitted in these areas. However, Policy ST2 allows for some flexibility in how the proposed distribution of housing is managed locally and how the Council will treat additional growth beyond that proposed in the Local Plan through the focus of community development in neighbourhood plans. Growth in rural Bassetlaw will be monitored regularly to give communities and developers and up-to-date picture of housing commitments in these settlements. It is recognised that this will change frequently as permissions vary in their delivery and lapse rates. The proposed cap in previous versions of the Local Plan has been removed and replaced with a requirement per eligible settlement. This is detailed in Policy ST2 and evidenced within the revised Rural Settlement Study 2020.
1197063	Resident	Para 5.1.44 To ensure a sustainable strategy is delivered, the number of homes must be balanced with the number of jobs expected to be delivered in the District. Where are the jobs being created in the District? Apart from additional builders of course.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. 10 sites are identified for employment growth, 8 already have planning permission. The main areas for new employment are in Worksop, Harworth and Retford and along the A1/A57 strategic growth corridors.
1197063	Resident	No potential reduction in village sizes acknowledge anywhere in the Local Plan? This could happen.	The Plan is looking to deliver growth, not to reduce the number of homes.
REF282	National Trust	Support elements of the Spatial Strategy, in particular bullet point 1 which promotes the efficient use of land, re-use of brownfield land, and protection of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land. Concerned about bullet point 2(d) which is overly permissive in relation to development in the countryside. Suggest that this should be qualified by inserting the words 'small scale' or 'of an appropriate scale'. This recognises that development in rural areas may be less inherently sustainable due to limited populations, transport, services etc. as well as the need to protect biodiversity and landscapes. Object to bullet point 2(c) which seeks to allocate 'at least 199.6ha' of surplus strategic employment land. The Economic Development Needs Assessment provides no evidence of need for this land. There is also a lack of evidence that this allocation would not impact detrimentally on regeneration of brownfield sites in the district or elsewhere. See also our comments on Policies ST8 and SEM1.	The text in ST1 is considered to be flexible "by supporting development in the countryside necessary to that location, including those which support the rural economy and where consistent with other policies in this Local Plan." There are other policies in the Local Plan which guide the scale and type of development in the countryside. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which justifies the site at Apleyhead. The Local Plan does try to put as much development as possible on brownfield sites but there is not enough suitable land available to meet local needs. So some greenfield land is needed.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF285	Home Builders Federation	Policy ST1 sets out a 5 tier settlement hierarchy and HLS provision for a minimum of 9,087 dwellings (478 dwellings per annum) for the period 2018-2037. There is no certainty that Neighbourhood Plans will come forward with the inclusion of housing site allocations. The sufficiency of the Council's HLS should not be delegated to Neighbourhood Plans without evidence of the deliverability and / or developability of such sites. There is no recourse if a Neighbourhood Plan is not made. It should be clear that the Council will undertake the necessary plan-making work should the Neighbourhood Planning process not successfully deliver the strategy of the Local Plan.	The Plan does not rely on Neighbourhood Plan allocations for the majority of the housing requirement. A significant amount of development will come from sites with planning permission and proposed Local Plan site allocations. Housing delivery will continue to be reviewed on an annual basis and the Local Plan will be reviewed within five years to ensure the housing requirement can continue to be met.
REF286	Pegasus Group	The overarching spatial strategy at Policy ST1 sets out the scale and distribution of development across the District, and provides a housing requirement of 9,087 dwellings for the District over the plan period 2018 – 2037 (478 dwellings per annum), 10% of which will be on sites of no larger than 1ha. This housing requirement is then distributed to Worksop, Retford and Harworth (a minimum of 5,483 dwellings), allocated Neighbourhood Plan sites in Large Rural Settlements (a minimum of 1,764 dwellings), non-allocated sites or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans in Small Rural Settlements (a minimum of 1,090 dwellings), and 750 dwellings at the Bassetlaw Garden Village. Policy ST1 C) proposes that 10% of the overall housing requirement for the District will be delivered on sites of 1 hectare or less, and 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 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.	Support noted and welcome.
REF288	JVH Planning	The strategy for the distribution of new homes is based on the three main settlements of Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes; the larger rural villages, smaller villages; a garden village and the redevelopment of a power station site. The Plan is confusing over the amount of land to be allocated in each of these tiers or locations once the existing commitments in the form of planning permissions have been deducted. It appears that Worksop there is a remaining required allocation of +546 In Retford there is a remaining required allocation of +528 Harworth Bircotes 0 In the Larger Rural Settlements ? [impossible to deduce from the plan] In the smaller rural settlements -319 In a Garden Village +750 As a result of this the Plan is misrepresenting the position in the small rural settlements as set out in table ST2, which is completely misleading. The table implies that each village will be able to allocate a 20% figure over and above the number of dwellings in the settlement at 2018. This is clearly not the case as the overall figure for the smaller villages has already been exceeded. The Plan is completely unworkable as it is presently drafted.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF288	JVH Planning	Object to Policy ST1 on the basis that it includes new settlements at Cottam and at the A57/A1, which are unsustainable and undeliverable. It implies that there will be allocations in the main towns, but it is known already there is no requirement at Harworth Bircotes and it suggests that there will be a 20% growth in the smaller villages, which we know is incorrect because that number is already exceeded by the commitments. Object to the Cottam Power Station and the Garden Village being included in the strategy and suggest that the whole settlement hierarchy needs to be re visited with proper consideration of the level of homes that are needed over the Plan Period. The proposed development in the Garden Village and Cottam can be redistributed within the existing settlement hierarchy to settlements that can deliver new homes and can provide existing social and physical infrastructure.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF289	Lichfields	Oppose the 20% growth cap ("Rural Growth figure") that is proposed to be applied to Small Rural Settlements and consider it to be at odds with Part C (1, c) of this same policy which, in Small Rural Settlements, seeks to deliver a minimum of 1090 dwellings on non-allocated sites or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhoods Plans. Support Policy ST1 seeking to define a 'minimum' number of dwellings to be delivered across the settlement hierarchy and, subject to the conflicting growth cap for Small Rural Settlements being removed, such an approach would ensure that that the draft Local Plan is sufficiently flexible to meet the demand for new housing throughout its lifetime. Part B (2, d) of Policy ST1 is welcomed in providing support for the development in the countryside where it is necessary to that location, including where it would support the rural economy. This approach is pragmatic and reflects paragraph 83 of the NPPF's support for a prosperous rural economy.	The Strategy is seeking to ensure that there is a mix of development in all areas of the District. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF290	JVH Planning	The strategy for the distribution of new homes is based on the three main settlements of Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes; the larger rural villages, smaller villages; a garden village and the redevelopment of a power station site. However the Plan is confusing over the amount of land to be allocated in each of these tiers or locations once the existing commitments in the form of planning permissions have been deducted. It appears that In Worksop there is a remaining required allocation of +546 In Retford there is a remaining required allocation of +528 Harworth Bircotes 0 In the Larger Rural Settlements ? [impossible to deduce from the plan] In the smaller rural settlements -319 In a Garden Village +750 As a result of this the Plan is misrepresenting the position in the small rural settlements as set out in table ST2, which is completely misleading. The table implies that each village will be able to allocate a 20% figure over and above the number of dwellings in the settlement at 2018. This is clearly not the case as the overall figure for the smaller villages has already been exceeded. The Plan is completely unworkable.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF290	JVH Planning	Object to Policy ST1 on the basis that it includes new settlements at Cottam and at the A57/A1, which we consider are unsustainable and undeliverable. It implies that there will be allocations in the main towns, but it is known already there is no requirement at Harworth Bircotes and it suggests that there will be a 20% growth in the smaller villages, which we know is incorrect because that number is already exceeded by the commitments. Object to the Cottam Power Station and the Garden Village being included in the strategy and suggest that the whole settlement hierarchy needs to be re visited with proper consideration of the level of homes that are needed over the Plan Period. The proposed development in the Garden Village and Cottam can be redistributed within the existing settlement hierarchy to settlements that can deliver new homes and can provide existing social and physical infrastructure.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF291	Heyford Developments Ltd	<p>This draft policy identifies that the District will accommodate a minimum of 9,087 dwellings (478 dwellings per annum) for the plan period 2018-2037. In relation to the dwellings to be provided within the main towns; large rural settlements; and small rural settlements it is understood from the Land Availability Assessment, 2019 that 6,949 dwellings have planning permission; 540 dwellings are subject to a Neighbourhood Plan allocation, without planning permission; and 2,881 dwellings are to be allocated in the draft Plan. This provides an oversupply of around 1,689 dwellings (19.5%) against the proposed housing requirement of 9,087 dwellings (also taking into account completions from 2018/19). The LAA does not appear to factor in the potential for non implementation (or a 'lapse rate') of these planning permissions and allocations. Paragraph 2.16 states "where deliverability is questionable sites will be discounted", but no further details are provided. There is no commentary provided on why lapse rates have not been considered i.e. local market conditions and/or evidence of implementation rates in the District. The suggested oversupply should therefore be treated with caution. Further consideration should be given to the level of risk associated with the potential for non-implementation of those sites identified in the supply in order to ensure the overall spatial strategy is deliverable. This would be in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance on Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessments which states that an overall risk assessment should be made as to whether sites will come forward as anticipated (Paragraph 024 ID: 3-024-20190722). Whilst the NPPF requires plans to meet 10% of the housing land supply via sites of 1 hectare or less, it should also be recognised that minor sites (9 or fewer dwellings) generally have a higher rate of non implementation given the nature of the landownership and potential developers. The evidence and draft Plan should reflect upon the degree of reliance on these small sites within the rural settlements supply. In relation to the proposed Bassetlaw Garden Village, the LAA assumes 60 dwellings will be delivered in 2024-2029; 420 dwellings in 2029-2034; and 270 dwellings in 2034-2037. Appendix C provides some further information on the site-specific trajectory. It states: "Evidence (NLP Start to Finish, 2016) indicates the site is developable beyond 5 years. Large sites have a longer lead in period but deliver at higher rates once established. This timescale also accords with the development of Harworth Colliery which will eventually accommodate approx. 1,000 dwellings." Further text within the LAA details that the Harworth Colliery site had a lead in time of approximately 8 years. The Site Selection Methodology Background Paper (2020) provides justification for the selection of the Bassetlaw Garden Village in relation to its sustainable location and ability to provide for infrastructure. No information related to deliverability is provided. No further information on deliverability is provided in the Bassetlaw New Settlement Addendum Paper (2020). Have significant concerns regarding the ability of this draft allocation to provide 750 dwellings within the Plan period, particularly in a sustainable manner. The anticipated supply set out Policy ST1 and the LAA supporting evidence should be reviewed to take account of risks related to non-implementation (lapse rates) and to provide a trajectory for Bassetlaw Garden Village that relates to the site-specific circumstances. The growth identified in Policy ST1 (and ST2) is in part reliant on the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans and their ability to identify sufficient sites which can deliver the identified housing. As an example, the draft Blyth Neighbourhood Plan is reliant on one site to deliver practically its entire housing requirement, despite there being no evidence on this being deliverable or developable. This may be the case for a number of other Neighbourhood Plans and this presents risks to the Council's housing supply.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Garden Villages in other areas of the country. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020). Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities. A lapse rate has been factored in to assumptions for under delivery in the rural area.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF291	Heyford Developments Ltd	Our comments in relation to the 20% growth 'cap' for Large Rural Settlements. The spatial strategy needs to be revisited in light of this, as well as the issues we have raised with the Council's housing land supply and trajectory. Consider further housing should be directed towards sustainable Large Rural Settlements such as Blyth for the reasons set out in our response to Policy ST2. This will have an effect on the spatial strategy and Policy ST1. Support the uplift in the housing requirement to 478 dwellings per annum to support economic growth, however the spatial strategy needs to ensure that housing and employment needs are aligned, so that housing is proposed where there is demand for employment. As paragraph 3.5 of the draft Plan notes, 'the logistics sector continues to grow, with significant investment taking place, and market interest evidenced, along the A57 and A1 corridors'. The recently upgraded A1 junction to the north of Blyth offers a significant opportunity to meet this need and assist in delivering economic growth in the District. Housing should be located nearby to ensure jobs and workers are closely located and accessible by public transport – there are regular buses running between Blyth and the A1 roundabout to the north. Suggested changes: 1. Publish a Statement of Common Ground to demonstrate compliance with the duty to cooperate in relation to outstanding matters including unmet housing needs from neighbouring authorities. 2. The anticipated supply set out in Policy ST1 and the LAA supporting evidence should be reviewed to take account of risks related to non-implementation (lapse rates) and to provide a trajectory for Bassetlaw Garden Village that relates to the site-specific circumstances (see our concerns set out in response to Policy ST3). 3. A mechanism for guarding against non-delivery of housing through Neighbourhood Plans should be included (see Policy ST2). 4. In light of the matters raised in relation to Policy ST1, and issues around supply, trajectory and deliverability, further growth should be directed to the sustainable settlement of Blyth.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. The Local Plan states that neighbouring authorities have agreed to meet their own housing and employment needs. This will be evidenced through forthcoming Statements of Common Ground. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Garden Villages in other areas of the country. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020). Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities. A lapse rate has been factored in to assumptions for under delivery in the rural area.
REF292	JVH Planning	The strategy for the distribution of new homes is based on the three main settlements of Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes; the larger rural villages, smaller villages; a garden village and the redevelopment of a power station site. However the Plan is very confusing over the amount of land to be allocated in each of these tiers or locations once the existing commitments in the form of planning permissions have been deducted. It appears that In Worksop there is a remaining required allocation of +546 In Retford there is a remaining required allocation of +528 Harworth Bircotes 0 In the Larger Rural Settlements ? [impossible to deduce from the plan] In the smaller rural settlements -319 In a Garden Village +750 As a result of this the Plan is misrepresenting the position in the small rural settlements as set out in table ST2, which is completely misleading. The table implies that each village will be able to allocate a 20% figure over and above the number of dwellings in the settlement at 2018. This is clearly not the case as the overall figure for the smaller villages has already been exceeded. The Plan is completely unworkable.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
REF292	JVH Planning	Object to Policy ST1 on the basis that it includes new settlements at Cottam and at the A57/A1, which we consider are unsustainable and undeliverable. It implies that there will be allocations in the main towns, but it is known already there is no requirement at Harworth Bircotes and it suggests that there will be a 20% growth in the smaller villages, which we know is incorrect because that number is already exceeded by the commitments. Object to the Cottam Power Station and the Garden Village being included in the strategy and suggest that the whole settlement hierarchy needs to be re visited with proper consideration of the level of homes that are needed over the Plan Period. The proposed development in the Garden Village and Cottam can be redistributed within the existing settlement hierarchy to settlements that can deliver new homes and can provide existing social and physical infrastructure.	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
			development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.
1197091	William Davis	Overall the spatial strategy is supported. Worksop is considered to be the most sustainable settlement and provides a good range of services/facilities and employment opportunities. The Housing Trajectory identifies a total supply of 10339 dwellings; this represents a 13% buffer over the housing target. The Local Plans Expert Group recommended that a 20% supply over the housing target should be included in the Local Plan to provide flexibility; providing this would be consistent with national policy (paragraph 59 regarding the need to significantly (our emphasis) boost the supply of housing) and would meet the tests of soundness. Bassetlaw should aim to have a supply of deliverable/developable sites of at least 10904 dwellings during the plan period and preferably more; this requires additional allocations of around 565 dwellings; a further buffer on top of this would also be appropriate to address any shortfall due to delays at the proposed new settlements. As the most sustainable settlement, Worksop represents the most appropriate place to make these additional allocations. Some of the growth at rural settlements is to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans; there are risks with this approach. Neighbourhood Plans may not allocate any land, allocate insufficient land or allocate non-deliverable sites. This could mean that housing need is not delivered meaning the plan is not effective, failing one of the tests of soundness. It is necessary to ensure that sufficient sites are allocated in the Local Plan to deliver the housing requirement of at least 10904 dwellings during the plan period. The trajectory identifies that a number of these sites have been submitted by landowners who have confirmed their availability in the five year period; while a number are non-major development, it is unclear if there is a housebuilder involved with the major development sites and whether there is the clear evidence to demonstrate they meet the NPPF definition of deliverable.	The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. In terms of housing supply in a Local Plan, the NPPF does not recommend a 20% buffer. The NPPF does apply three buffers in relation to the five year housing land supply, 5%, 10%, and 20%. The higher 20% should be applied where housing delivery has not met its housing requirement target over a sustained period. Bassetlaw has consistently delivered well in excess of the housing need figure over the past four years. As such, a 5% buffer should be applied to the Five Year Housing Land Supply. Upon submission for examination, the Local Plan is likely to have a larger buffer due to the number of commitments and site allocations. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy.
1197164	The Planning & Environment Studio	Objection: Development Boundary – London Road, Retford. Autism East Midlands (AEM) is a registered charity established in 1968. Its mission is to advocate, provide and develop high-quality services, information, and support, in partnership with others, for all those whose lives are affected by autism. It strives to recognise and respond to the needs of the individual, enabling autistic people to live their lives with dignity, choice and independence. To help achieve these aims AEM provide a wide range of services to help individuals to live their lives the way they want, including support for independent living. Autism East Midlands own property and land on the southern edge of Retford at South Lodge, London Road (see attached plan) as a registered care home, including specialist supported living units. The development limit is not clearly justified nor reflects significant sustainability benefits or settlement character function. It is also inconsistent with the town's Conservation Area boundary. Moreover, the proposed development boundary adjustments elsewhere across the town would serve to have far more significant impacts upon character and settlement form than the changes proposed in this representation. The Settlement Development Limit for the area around South Lodge and London Road is not proposed for adjustment in the emerging Regulation 18 consultation local plan. The established limits for the south of the town within the adopted Core Strategy take a convoluted line to enclose the Allison Avenue housing estate to the east, before narrowing markedly to return back along Grove Road, before returning southwards to enclose two large properties and their curtilages at The Hardmoors and Montague House fronting London Road. The SDL then crosses London Road to enclose properties to the west of London Road. There is no explanation for the specific reasons why this line has been retained in the emerging Local Plan apart from through apparent historic inertia. The evidence base used to justify the policy framework of the adopted Core Strategy – from its 2009 Issues and Options Paper to the 2010 Publication Draft and on to adoption does not include any reference to a settlement development limits study or review. No case is set out in adopted policy why the development boundary has been drawn as it has. Whilst AEM does not challenge the overall logic for most delineation between the settlement and open countryside, it is equally not satisfactory that historic delineation is maintained without justification	The request for a revision to the proposed development boundary for Retford has been considered during the revision of the local Plan. The request however does not meet the stated methodology for reviewing the development boundary as identified within the revised Spatial Strategy Paper 2020. Therefore no change to the development boundary is proposed to this part of Retford within the November 2020 Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
		<p>or evidence, when it is seen appropriate that many other elements of the plan are (and should be) periodically reviewed through the Local Plan process. As such it is vulnerable to failing the tests of soundness in respect of being positively prepared to support sustainable development and justified - being based upon evidence. The implications of the SDL are significant in relation to spatial policy which would apply within or outwith that line, and as such has sustainability consequences. AEM proposes that through the current Local Plan process the SDL to the immediate west of South Lodge, should be re-drawn to follow the southern boundary of the site, immediately south of the long-established driveway to South Lodge from London Road. The existing SDL and our proposal is indicated on the Policies Map extract below. The proposed change to the SDL is justified as follows: Settlement Form. There is no logical justification for the exclusion of South Lodge from the SDL. The large detached dwelling and its curtilage/associated paddock is a clear continuation of the character of the established area of large dwellings found to the southern reaches of London Road known as White Houses. South Lodge is a large property of Edwardian heritage which associates closely with Montague House and Hardmoorlands in terms of proximity, scale, setting and character, yet those properties fall within the SDL and South Lodge does not. There are no clear and defining permanent boundary lines to the north of South Lodge which physically or perceptually indicate the edge of the town, nor separate the house and grounds from the town and immediate neighbourhood. The prominent coniferous hedgerow / treeline and post-and-rail fencing south of Montague House is neither a permanent, historic nor positive contributor to local character. The existing (and by definition 'proposed') SDL around the White Houses locale includes the large mid 20th century housing estate at Allison Avenue.</p>	
1197164	The Planning & Environment Studio	<p>This area is of a wholly different character but actually extends the SDL to the east and south of South Lodge. South Lodge and grounds therefore do not represent an outlying or disconnected element of the built framework of Retford and there is no discernable break (having regard to established character) between it at other large dwellings within the SDL. Conversely there is a clear and established break in character and physical delineation to the south of South Lodge, far more identifiable than the existing SDL boundary line. The hedgerow and driveway serving South Lodge from London Road has been established since the house was built in the early 20th century (O.S. historic maps confirm this), and this presents a long-standing physical boundary feature. It is the landscape/townscape character change which is most abrupt and definitive immediately beyond this line, and which sets an appropriate and functional SDL than the existing. The character to the south of this line is wholly arable and the change is abrupt. A very large, open field sets the immediate rural hinterland to the town. The scale of the landscape and its low broken hedge to London Road are clearly a significant change in character to that north of the gateway to South Lodge. To the south there is no pavement and soft verges affording a rural landscape character typical of the landscape character area. The prominent gateway to South Lodge announces the southern edge of the town, with pavements, ornamental hedgerows and street lighting to both sides of London Road and change in speed limits emphasising the entry to Retford. The remodelled gateway itself is of a substantial ornamental design and prominence, recently approved under (18/01532/FUL) and otherwise generally not characteristic of the rural landscape. The vehicular entrance to South Lodge can therefore be seen to announce the entry to Retford itself on arrival from the south. The frontage to the South Lodge site includes the end point of the domestic and managed long hedgerow which continues northwards to fro Montague House and Hardmoorlands as a strongly residential feature. This abrupt change in character from arable farmland to leafy urban area is maintained immediately east of South Lodge along the same parallel by the same sudden transition from the Allison Avenue estate to the arable open landscape. However in that area the SDL does follow the break from farmland to residential area. Conservation Area designation and boundaries are not necessarily reflective of urban and rural setting or delineation. South Lodge it is pertinent to note that Retford Conservation Area boundary follows the South Lodge driveway as proposed as SDL in this</p>	<p>The request for a revision to the proposed development boundary for Retford has been considered during the revision of the local Plan. The request however does not meet the stated methodology for reviewing the development boundary as identified within the revised Spatial Strategy Paper 2020. Therefore no change to the development boundary is proposed to this part of Retford within the November 2020 Local Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
		representation. The Conservation Area Analysis (BDC) is reasonably recent, adopted in 2009. This describes the special character of the White Houses area. This recognises the semi-independent history of the area to that of Retford and describes its low density character where the large	
REF298	Axis PED Ltd	<p>In relation to 8-hectare site at Carlton Forest. The east of the site benefits from planning permission (reference 18/01093/OUT) for employment uses. Pre-application discussions have recently taken place with the Council regarding employment uses on the western part of the site. It is anticipated that a planning application for employment uses for the western part of the site will be submitted within a few months. These two areas are shown on Figure 2. Part of the site is previously developed land and the entire site is underutilised since the site's former use as a quarry ceased. Support the Council's proposed overall strategy and objectives in relation to economic growth and development. The Local Plan should create the right conditions to ensure economic growth can take place in the right areas. FCC's site is suitably located to deliver employment land in a location which, whilst outside of the settlement boundary, is well connected to the main urban area of Worksop. Further, employment development has already been established on part of the site through the granting of planning permission (ref: 18/01093/OUT). Anticipate that this development will commence in 2022. The west of the site is currently the subject of pre-application discussions and is to be leased this year and developed as the tenant needs to move from their existing premises within Bassetlaw, this will allow an existing business and significant employer to remain within the District. FCC's site lies to the north of Worksop adjacent to existing development and employment sites. Worksop is identified as the most sustainable location for significant growth and provides the best opportunity to deliver the objectives of regional and local industrial strategies. Support paragraph B1 which promotes the efficient and effective use of land and the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations. In accordance with the NPPF this will help to achieve sustainable development including economic growth in the appropriate locations. Historically been subject to quarrying activity, part of the site is previously developed therefore the proposed employment uses are an efficient use of the currently underutilised site. Broadly support Policy ST1 which sets out the Council's Spatial Strategy and settlement hierarchy. This Policy directs development to appropriate locations in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. The land to the south and south west of FCC's site forms part of an existing employment site and mixed use allocation. When developed, this would bring continuous development up to FCC's site from Worksop. It is considered that greater support should be provided within the supporting text for sites within the rural area, but outside of rural settlements that are sustainably and well located to contribute to the Council's employment land supply. FCC's site is well related to the existing settlement of Worksop and is suitably located to deliver sustainable economic development in line with the aspirations of the Local Plan and NPPF.</p>	<p>Planning permission exists for part of the site and an occupier is in place to develop the remainder in 2022. On that basis, there is no need to allocate the site a tenant is lined up to occupy. Therefore there is no need to allocate this land. The planning permission and development management process is addressing the needs of the site.</p>
REF299	Gladmans	<p>Broadly support the Council's proposed spatial strategy which seeks to deliver sustainable development and growth in line with the Council's ambition to achieve a 'step change' in the local economy. The spatial strategy will be delivered through a range of sites in sustainable locations including a Garden Village and a Priority Regeneration Area. Support the exploration into the delivery of a Garden Village and Priority Regeneration Areas, of the view that the spatial strategy should be modified to acknowledge the scope for further sustainable development at Bevercotes Colliery over the course of the plan period 2018-2037. The inclusion of Bevercotes as an additional Priority Regeneration Area for mixed-use development, aligns with the overall spatial strategy for the district which seeks to prioritise the regeneration of previously developed land and strives for a step change in economic growth. Policy ST1 criterion B1 would also benefit from a modification which makes clear that development, in addition to the sites identified within B2(A), should be directed towards sites on previously developed land which can be made sustainable through their re-development, namely Bevercotes Colliery.</p>	<p>The former Bevercotes Colliery is covered by Local Wildlife Sites and is identified by the Bassetlaw HRA as having the potential to host breeding and foraging protected bird species associated with the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. Allocating the site is therefore contrary to legislation and national planning policy. However, the site has planning permission for employment development which is considered to be deliverable as a mitigation package has previously been agreed.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF300	Natural England	Welcome the vision and the emphasis that it gives to the green agenda particularly the recognition of the need to address climate change. Pleased to see that the benefits of multi-functional green and blue infrastructure have been highlighted and its importance to health and wellbeing.	Support noted and welcome.
REF300	Natural England	Note that this paragraph makes reference to Bassetlaw Garden Village Background Paper, 2019 (note that there is an addendum 2020 version). Concerned that the potential impacts on the Clumber Park Site of Special Scientific Interest have not been sufficiently considered. Welcome the inclusion of bullet point B1 which includes the protection of Best & Most Versatile (BMV) land which complies with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	A Recreational Impact Assessment is underway in partnership with Natural England to better understand the potential impacts of the Garden Village on Clumber Park SSSI. Support for the reference to agricultural land is welcome.
REF308	Resident	There are many references within the Draft Plan to 'sustainable development'. The Plan adopts the World Commission on Environment and Development's definition of 'sustainable' (1987) - ie: "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (Glossary P 182). This is a profound statement which has been widely adopted as THE definition of sustainability. It is a contradiction of terms to talk about sustainable development on greenfield sites, particularly where it is prime agricultural land. Destroying food producing land clearly compromises the ability of future generations to meet their needs. This amounts to 'greenwash' and references to sustainable development on all greenfield sites should be removed or, the definition of 'sustainable' should be changed in the Plan. In the plan, it would appear to be more in keeping with the Government's definition as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework - which involves securing net gains from three overarching objectives ie - economic, social and environmental though this in itself, makes a mockery of the concept of sustainability.	Paragraph 7 of the NPPF indicates: 'At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'. This accords with the aims and objectives of the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The Local Plan does try to put as much development as possible on brownfield sites but there is not enough suitable land available to meet local needs. So some greenfield land is needed.
REF316	Fisher German	The Spatial Strategy which proposes a hybrid approach to meeting the District's development needs is broadly supported. The proposed role of Tuxford as a 'Large Rural Settlement' reflects the town's role and sustainability credentials. Tuxford benefits from a range of local amenities and services including shopping, doctor's surgery, public houses and educational facilities primary school and Tuxford Academy. Tuxford also has excellent transport links, particularly the A1 from the which the wider motorway network is available with good rail links at Retford to the north and Newark to the south. It is considered sound for the town to be identified for future economic and residential growth. The Council's ambition to deliver increased housing, above base Local Housing Need established through the standardised methodology, is also supported. An uplift in housing is required to ensure an active working population is readily available in order to deliver the District's economic growth aspirations. This is a positive strategy which reflects the aims of the NPPF, both in supporting economic growth and boosting significantly the supply of housing. A buffer of 5% is considered appropriate when calculating housing land supply requirements, having regard for the 2019 housing delivery test results. With regards to spatial distribution, the Council intends to locate 20% of its housing requirement in the Large Rural Settlements of Tuxford, Blyth, Carlton in Lindrick and Costhorpe, Langold, Misterton, Cottam Garden Community. This approach is supported as it focuses development in the most sustainable locations. Concerns are however raised in respect of the Bassetlaw Garden Village (Policy ST3). The Garden Village allocation is intended to make a significant contribution to achieving and meeting the housing requirement within the Plan period, equating to just over 8% of the total requirement. To ensure a sound Plan it is imperative, therefore, to ensure that the Council's delivery assumptions for the site are realistic. The assumptions currently made in respect of the delivery of the site are considered ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. In addition to the above approximately 12% of the total requirement for the Plan period is reliant on Neighbourhood Plans, or non-allocated sites across the 42 Small Rural Settlements to be delivered. This is a significant quantum of development across numerous settlements and has the potential to risk the delivery of the Plan.	The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Garden Villages in other areas of the country. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020). Spreading development across the District will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development that maintains and supports local services and facilities.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF321	IBA Planning	Support the Plan as presently drafted and welcome and support the inclusion of their land as part of the Peak Hills Farm housing and employment land allocations. Worksop is quite rightly identified as the principal town and most sustainable location for significant growth within the District and provides the best opportunity to deliver the objectives of regional and local growth and regeneration strategies. Its identification as a main town within the Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy (Policy ST1) is supported. The Draft Plan is considered to be appropriately ambitious to achieve the Council's stated Vision and Strategic Objectives for the Plan period up to 2037, yet sufficiently realistic (certainly as far as delivery on the Peak Hills Farm allocation is concerned) to provide stakeholders and ultimately the Examining Inspector with confidence over delivery in line with annual projections and certainty regarding issues of soundness and compliance with national planning policy. The increased annual housing requirements of 478 dwellings per annum (resulting in a minimum housing provision of 5483 dwellings in Worksop, Retford and Harworth) under Policy ST1:C.1a is supported, as is the increased employment provision in appropriate locations to meet future economic development needs and safeguard existing employment sites for B1 offices, B2 industry and B8 storage and distribution under Policy ST1:C.2. The proposed employment allocation at Carlton Forest (EM005 – 10.6 hectares) is welcomed and supported – with 5 hectares of this, of course, already having been consented under LPA reference 15/01477/OUT.	Support noted and welcome.
REF323	Emery Planning	This Policy seeks to set out the Spatial Strategy for development in Bassetlaw over the Plan period. Support the focus of the policy on delivering sustainable development and growth through, amongst other things, promoting the efficient and effective use of land and the re-use of previously developed land, which our client's site is well placed in assisting with. Note and welcome the fact that housing and employment targets set out are identified as minimums.	Support noted and welcome.
REF325	Consultant	The draft Local Plan aspires to encourage economic growth: "To make a real step change in economicconditions in the District" (paragraph 1.5.1). This approach is supported. The Plan also notes, (paragraph 3.5) the continuing growth of the logistics sector, with market interest "evidenced" along the A1 corridor in particular. The Council-approved commercial development at Blyth, known as Symmetry Park, is an acknowledged response to this interest. It is understood that the developers intended to develop the site speculatively – that is, the developers were aware of and responded to market forces but that the initial commitment to the site was made with no end users in place, thus emphasising the strength of these pressures. Suggest that the number, size, type and distribution of employment areas is inadequate to meet the Council's over-arching aspirations in two main and related respects. Whilst the emerging Local Plan correctly notes the attractiveness to employment developers of sites close to main transport links (and the A1 corridor is specifically mentioned in this regard) and also identifies a need to attract footloose businesses, the range of sites proposed for employment development does not respond to either of these factors. Footloose businesses by their very nature can pick and choose between sites to achieve their optimum location. If suitable sites in one area are not available, the businesses simply locate in areas where they are. This suggests a need to allocate as wider a choice of sites as possible consistent with other Local Plan objectives. At paragraph 5.1.57 the draft Plan notes the potential for economic growth above that provided for in the Local Plan as currently drafted with particular reference to strategic logistics growth (i.e. growth related to the transport and distribution sectors) and, at paragraph 5.1.58, notes specifically the increasing prominence of the A1 corridor.	The draft Local Plan allocates over 287 ha of employment land which the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2020 recognises is appropriate to meet the needs of the District to 2037. The Local Plan allocates a range of sites capable of identifying a range of business needs in a range of locations, close to the Main Towns and along the A1/A57 growth corridors therefore meeting a range of different end user needs. Sites are expected to come forward over the plan period to meet changing needs.
REF327	Scrooby Parish	Para. 5.1.26 Figure 5 Perhaps the picture Figure 5: Housing Distribution would be better placed before para. 5.1.15 or at the end of section 5.1 as a recap. Para. 5.1.32 Small Rural Settlements Please clarify !!! this says that small rural settlements up to a maximum of 20% will be supported. BUT, is this an ASPIRATION, not a REQUIREMENT. However, every comment we hear is that this 20% is a mandatory REQUIREMENT. Policy ST1: Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy This says (amongst other things) "...that meets the evidenced needs for new houses and jobs..." and "...supports the necessary improvements to infrastructure and services...". Scrooby Parish and Neighbourhood Plan Team - Comments on the Draft	The spatial strategy in particular the approach to the rural area has been revised in response to updated evidence and representations to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy and that the terms used are clear for all users.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
		Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020 Date: 25th February 2020 Page 2 of 6 How does Item A talking about evidenced needs and infrastructure improvements reconcile with the blanket numbers based on a nominal incremental value of 20% in Policy ST2 being enforced upon us.	
REF331	Worksop College (C/O Teakwood Partners)	Policy ST1 seeks to direct development to appropriate locations in accordance with a settlement hierarchy. Small Rural Settlements ("SRS") fall second on this hierarchy, and where housing growth of up to 20% is supported, in accordance with Policy ST2. It notes that the distribution of the minimum number of homes will include 'a minimum of 1,090 dwellings on non-allocated sites or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans for the SRS'. Ranby is an SRS. The growth of SRS is supported, particularly at Ranby, where it is considered additional growth can be accommodated on land owned by the college to the east of the settlement, along Straight Mile. One of the main objectives of the NPPF is to significantly boost the supply of homes, noting the importance of ensuring a significant amount and variety of land can come forward for housing (paragraph 59). Paragraph 60 requires local planning authorities to plan for a minimum number of homes. The test should be whether development can be proven to be sustainable, (e.g. avoid or mitigate adverse impacts on the SRS and comply with other development management policies), rather than imposing an arbitrary cap on new housing. Imposing an arbitrary cap on the maximum number of homes supported for such areas is inconsistent with the NPPF, which renders this policy unsound. In order to make the plan sound, Part B.2.b) of Policy ST1 should be amended to remove reference to the 20% cap, or make it clear that the 20% figure has been used to identify a reliable and deliverable supply of housing land, but should not be used as an absolute cap on development. Beyond the SRS the settlement hierarchy also supports development in the countryside necessary to that location (Part B.2.d.), and where consistent with other policies in the draft BLP. This general approach is supported, but it should also allow for flexibility around exceptional circumstances such as providing enabling development for a major community benefit, beyond a blunt assessment of need.	This policy accords with Paragraph 65 of the NPPF which indicates: "Strategic policy-making authorities should establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, which shows the extent to which their identified housing need (and any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas) can be met over the plan period. Within this overall requirement, strategic policies should also set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas which reflects the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development and any relevant allocations." The approach taken to the rural area, in conjunction with other policies in the Plan is considered to be flexible and consistent with the NPPF.
REF347	NJL Consulting	Policy ST1 takes a positive approach to meeting future employment needs, allocating 108ha of new employment land (of which at least 81ha is expected to come forward by 2037) and at least 199.6ha of 'of strategic employment land to address a subregional/regional employment need and/or the significant expansion of a local business'. The Apleyhead Junction site (Draft Policy 9; SEM1) falls within this latter 'category' of strategic sites. Supporting text also seeks to focus growth to Worksop as one of three main towns and recognises the strategic importance of the A57 and A1 for employment. These overall ambitions are supported by Caddick, especially the ambition to enable the identification and release of suitable employment land on the A57 and A1 corridor. This support is predicated on the importance of ensuring that this ambition is not frustrated by site specific policies not aligning with this strategy. The release of land at Apleyhead Junction to meet employment needs is both welcomed and logical. Without an intervention of this nature, it would not be realistic for the Local Plan to achieve the step change in regeneration which is clearly sought by the Council. Whilst the identification of land releases to meet employment ambitions is welcomed, Policy ST1 Part C2 (Employment) should simply be confined to identifying the spatial approach to the employment allocations. Any reference to the type of employment that is intended to be provided within each location is not relevant and should be a matter for site specific policies. For the Local Plan's strategic vision of delivering a step change growth to be realised, the total employment land being proposed (307.98ha) (simplified to 308ha) must be met. If any part of this need is not delivered, then the overall vision and economic growth objectives for Bassetlaw would be unfulfilled. Indeed, the plan evidence base recognises the importance of all sites in the overall employment land offer. Policy ST1 should be amended to refer to the provision of 308ha of employment land to meet the economic objectives and the vision for Bassetlaw to 2037 and beyond. The emerging policies are inconsistent in their terminology. However, these policies can be remedied with simple	The Housing and Economic Development needs Assessment 2020 clarifies the approach taken to Apleyhead. It provides the justification for a strategic employment need: to address the regional/sub regional investment needs of significant indigenous growth and national and regional investment to meet exceptional, unanticipated needs over the plan period. The employment land policy will be clarified on that basis. It is appropriate for Policy ST1 to recognise that difference between the two categories of employment land. Terminology will be clarified for consistency.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
		revisions. For example, the policies use varying terminology, in referring to a mix of sub-regional /regional / footloose / major occupiers, which does not provide a clear description of the preferred uses and overall ambitions. This should be amended for consistency. Apleyhead Junction should be identified for a range of employment uses. That way, the key employment policies can align with the strategic vision and detailed policies including site allocations can follow on. Suggested policy changes 2. Employment: provision of land in appropriate locations to meet future economic development needs and safeguard existing employment sites for B1 offices, B2 industry and B8 storage and distribution as follows: a) At least 22.1 ha of employment land completed; b) At least 108 308ha of new employment land, of which at least 81ha is expected to come forward by 2037; c) At least 199.6ha of strategic employment land to address a sub-regional/regional employment need and/or the significant expansion of a local business.	
REF352 -	North and South Wheatley Parish Council	At the higher level, note that: • The population of Bassetlaw is projected to increase by 3.8% between now and 2037; an increase of 4350 (Para 3.12). • The population increase will be in the 65+ and 80+ age groups but a reduction is expected in the 16-64 age group. • The new housing requirement for Bassetlaw between now and 2037 is 9087 (Para 5.1.46). Do not see how and increase in population of 4350 would generate an increase in required housing of 9037 – over two houses per extra head of population	The increase in population is just one factor that is taken into consideration in determining the housing requirement for the District. Many existing households in Bassetlaw contain 'concealed households'. This happens where younger household members are unable to afford to buy or rent their own home. Also, there is a lack of the right types of home available for first time buyers, downsizers, families and specialist homes for older people. There is also a requirement to ensure there are enough homes to support jobs growth in the district. A growing older population means that there will be fewer people to take up jobs in the district. The calculation of the housing requirement takes into consideration all of these factors. The Council has undertaken an assessment of housing need in accordance with national policy (NPPF) and guidance (PPG on Housing and Economic Needs).
REF363 -	Resident	There again seems to be a mismatch in the number of houses to be built over the plan period. In the 2019 document on page 14 you quote a population increase of 5000. In your present document this figure is down graded to 4350 (without evidence where this figure comes from). Also in your 2019 document you proposed to build 6630 houses for this increase however in you latest document you propose to build 9087 properties to accommodate a smaller increase in population. Later in your present document on Para 5.1.42 you quote a figure of 307 houses required over a period of 19 years which equates to 5833.	The changes in housing numbers change to reflect changes to evidence baseline statistics. The housing requirement for the District takes into account 'concealed households'. This happens where younger household members are unable to afford to buy or rent their own home. Also, there is a lack of the right types of home available for first time buyers, downsizers, families and specialist homes for older people. There is also a requirement to ensure there are enough homes to support jobs growth in the district. A growing older population means that there will be fewer people to take up jobs in the district. The housing requirement and the changes seen reflect this. The Council has undertaken an assessment of housing need in accordance with national policy (NPPF) and guidance (PPG on Housing and Economic Needs).
REF366	Broadgrove	Policy ST1 states that “Development will focus on delivering sustainable development and growth, appropriate to the size of each settlement, that meets the evidenced need for new homes and jobs, regenerates the District’s town centres, and supports necessary improvements to infrastructure, services and facilities.” Harworth and Bircotes is identified as one of the Districts three main settlements and acknowledgement of the opportunity to focus investment and new development to support the regeneration of Bassetlaw’s third largest settlement and in particular the town centre. Paragraph 3.23	The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. A significant number of planning permissions have been granted in Harworth and Bircotes in recent years, which will result in the delivery of

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01	Bassetlaw's Spatial	Strategy	
		<p>states “The delivery of new homes has spearheaded the regeneration and renewal of many parts of the District – acting as a catalyst for physical change and often well-needed investment in social and environmental infrastructure - Harworth & Bircotes for example will effectively double its size in the future, attracting new industry and national retail chains as a result of the growth in the town.” Harworth being geographically located within the north of the district and has excellent connections to South Yorkshire and access to the A1. It also 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. There is a substantial level of employment land proposed in Harworth and Bircotes but no new housing allocations, which places a significant reliance on the delivery of the colliery site. Given the specific 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 again the overall housing target and lack of ambition for economic growth – contradictory to the aims of regenerating the town and improving the local centre. 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 currently proposed. The NPPF and NPPG do not provide particular guidance on how housing need should be distributed in a Local Plan. Without such guidance, it is down to Bassetlaw 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, however, it must be realistic, rational and soundly based. There is a significant disparity of future development across the north and south of the district. 100% of new housing allocations are proposed across the south of the district (including a new garden village) 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 rather than a new garden village. The development of a greenfield garden village with a minimum of 750 dwellings will have a detrimental effect on the potential that could be generated from additional growth and regeneration in Harworth. 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. One of the key issues raised in the Local Plan, and during the determination of planning applications by local residents is the lack of infrastructure required to adequately accommodate new development and provide support for existing residents of the town. The current strategy of allocating no new allocations and relying on existing permissions in Harworth is flawed and will not provide the appropriate levels of infrastructure to deal with existing shortages never mind mitigation and enhancement of the local services. The colliery site is heavily relied upon in the numbers of residential units that will be provided in Harworth during the plan period. This site, understandably given the issues around redeveloping such contaminated sites, has taken a number of years to come to fruition. Not only does this raise issues of delivery but how the required levels of affordable housing will be delivered. The colliery site owners have made a clear statement of intent by setting out that due to issues of viability they do not intend to provide affordable housing as part of their current application for the site. Dealing with affordable housing need the current strategy needs to increase the provision of affordable housing. The 2017 SHMA sets out a net need of 134 affordable units for the District. The delivery of affordable housing across the District has been poor and has exacerbated a significant shortfall. The level required has never been delivered and as can be seen below, has never reached 50% of the requirement across the District. The levels of completions in Harworth have been even more alarming from 2013.</p>	<p>approximately 2000+ new dwellings. This is considered appropriate to meet Harworth and Bircotes needs over the plan period so it is not considered appropriate or necessary to allocate land in Harworth and Bircotes as the settlements already have an appropriate level of housing supply to drive and support the regeneration of the area. Employment development in and around Harworth totals over 90ha which is considered appropriate to meet growth needs.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF366	Broadgrove	<p>Year Overall completions (District wide) Affordable completions (District wide) Harworth affordable completions % of affordable completions across the District 2017/18 551 57 52 10% 2016/17 462 64 47% 2015/16 338 7 0 0.02% 2014/15 241 24 0 0.99% 2013/14 249 14 0 0.05% The current policy framework has not worked, over the plan period, when considering the figures above. There is a stark difference between numbers of permissions and affordable housing delivery across 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, there would be a 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 Draft Local Plan recognises the importance of regeneration of the local centre and ability to attract national retailers. This will only be delivered with significant growth in population and ambitious housing numbers. The need to see a step change in housing delivery is also needed to provide housing numbers but also 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. The level of housing proposed to be delivered in Harworth within the Bassetlaw Plan 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 and new housing allocations identified. The site at Blyth Road also has the potential to provide a link road between Blyth Road and Styrrup Road. This is a piece of infrastructure that was identified during the determination of the two planning applications as potentially bringing significant benefits to the distribution of traffic and alleviating pressures from other developments in the local area. This site could support and enable the delivery of this infrastructure. The proposed site is also in a more sustainable location than some of the recent housing commitments in Harworth and Bircotes. The site is within walking distance of the town centre and also the closest site to the new employment commitments to the south of the town, which make a logical, sustainable reason for allocating as a housing site.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. A significant number of planning permissions have been granted in Harworth and Bircotes in recent years, which will result in the delivery of approximately 2000+ new dwellings. This is considered appropriate to meet Harworth and Bircotes needs over the plan period so it is not considered appropriate or necessary to allocate land in Harworth and Bircotes as the settlements already have an appropriate level of housing supply to drive and support the regeneration of the area. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which demonstrates the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. This increases the housing requirement over the plan period. By proposing growth in excess of the Standard Method this better addresses affordable housing and infrastructure capacity needs.</p>
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	<p>Unless Network Rail is willing to build new railway station at the Garden Village at Apply Head it will merely become an extension of housing into the Countryside. There is little evidence that BDC has applied this to existing developments within East Markham. There is little evidence of any attempts at regeneration in East Markham. East Markham PC does believe that BDC can deliver this.</p>	<p>Network Rail have given in principle support for the new railway station at the Garden Village. Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans should be reviewed regularly to ensure they are delivering the right amount, type and mix of development. The new policies in the emerging Local Plan are seeking to deliver sustainable patterns of development of the right type and mix, including affordable housing and specialist housing for older and disabled people. East Markham PC are able to review their Neighbourhood Plan should they wish to have more influence over the type of development in their area.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF475	Resident	Support of the overriding objectives of this Plan. Increasing housing and employment, while promoting healthy green living can only benefit Bassetlaw. A more thought out/deliverable approach to achieve the housing requirement should be considered. Creating a garden village will take enormous resource and funding. The towns in Bassetlaw are under-utilised with already improved transport links, they certainly support growth.	The new Garden Village is looking to the future, beyond the Local Plan period. The NPPF is very clear that we must plan for a minimum of fifteen years and look beyond this where possible. The Garden Village will be delivered in partnership with key infrastructure partners and stakeholders to ensure it can be delivered with the right infrastructure at the right time. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's/areas place in the settlement hierarchy. One of the main objectives of the Local Plan is to support and improve the towns. A range of development in Worksop, Retford and on the Garden Village site will assist in this process through the connections via public transport and the highway network. Improved cycling and walking and public transport will be designed to enable easy access to existing facilities and services in each town.
REF486	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	In recent years, because we didn't have a five year land supply and up –to-date planning policies, not had full control over what gets built and where in Bassetlaw. With this Plan and a land supply that is at least eight years plus, we can take back control. Therefore, in the first, five year review period, let's try to get what Bassetlaw deserves. Need to make demands to achieve our aims for greener, more sustainable development. In regard to meeting our affordable housing ambitions, our infrastructure asks, our housing mix and quality, we should press our demands. Whilst 18 house builders commented about how we had under calculated our housing numbers, only five commented on affordable housing and just two on design issues. That's where their focus will be, unless shifted by us. Local people tell us at every Planning Committee, and it's in every Neighbourhood Plan that people want bungalows or smaller properties to downsize into. Yet the schemes we've had from developers in recent years, with one or two notable exceptions, don't reflect that. Let this plan give power to the wishes of local people in this regard. Welcome much of your description, especially emphasising the manufacturing base of local industry and Bassetlaw being a centre for large firms to locate to. What advantage is there in talking about Worksop as a former mining community? There's no mining heritage to exploit for tourism. Describing us as such, conjures up a sense of loss, a sense of past, good times that are unavailable now. Don't describe Retford as a former coaching stop, so why reference Worksop and it's mining? It's been twenty five years since the last colliery shift, the merry-go trains with their marshalling yards have gone, Firbeck and Harworth are being built over, Shireoaks and Manton are greening over and Manton Wood takes over more of Manton pit. Mining has no meaning for large sections of the population and for those moving into Harworth, Shireoaks and Gateford. Be bold, ditch the reference to our mining past unless you can be positive about it. Talk about our proximity to Sherwood Forest as a benefit to our economy; why not mention our proximity to Doncaster-Sheffield airport, its Advanced Manufacturing Park and the AMP in Sheffield/Rotherham? Describe Worksop as the destination of choice for international companies such as Cerealto, MBA Polymers, Schulz, Laing O'Rourke and Irizimar. Can a case be made for arguing its strong on aerospace and defence sectors – Cinch, Eaton, Rockford, ICON aerospace and perhaps the businesses at Gamston if they are of any sophistication? Welbeck is a business as well as a heritage asset. 250 people are employed by the estate with a further several hundred hosted by the estate through its rented offices and units.	It is important context that Bassetlaw's more recent history is referenced as that emphasises how far the District has progressed but also the extent of work still needed to be achieved to deliver the step change in the economy identified by the Council Plan. The draft plan is a very positive and ambitious Plan setting out a framework to deliver the spatial planning priorities for the District over the next 15 years or so. The Plan also identifies positive plans to regenerate Marnham, Cottam and other brownfield sites within our towns. Paragraph 5.1.57 acknowledges Bassetlaw's links to Doncaster-Sheffield Airport. As the Plan for Bassetlaw it would be inappropriate to promote the employment sites of another District. the purpose of this Plan is to promote the employment assets of Bassetlaw. Acknowledge that reference to Bassetlaw's businesses should be highlighted, although several are listed in the context. The role of Welbeck will be better reflected in the rural economy supporting text.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST01 Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy			
REF489	Chesterfield Borough Council	Fully support the continuing use of the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw HMA grouping as an appropriate geography for establishing housing need. Support the housing requirement of 478 d/p/a as this would not result in a shortfall across the HMA. It is acknowledged that this is higher than both the LHN (307 d/p/a) and the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Strategic Housing Market Assessment OAN Update 2017 (374 d/p/a including affordability uplift and to support baseline economic growth). The implications of this level of housing growth should be carefully monitored and discussed as part of regular Local Plan Liaison Meetings to highlight any unexpected unintended adverse effects on other districts housing delivery within the HMA and to inform the next round of Local Plan reviews. It is suggested that this could be included within the Monitoring Framework.	The Council will continue to positively engage with neighbouring authorities and authorities with the HMA to ensure that the implications of the spatial strategy are understood and impacts managed appropriately.